

UNDOING SCOTLAND AFTER  
DEVOLUTION IN LIZ LOCHHEAD'S  
DRAMATIC ADAPTATIONS OF CLASSICAL  
TEXTS ON PAGE AND STAGE

MINKA PARASKEVOVA

A thesis submitted in partial fulfilment of the  
requirements for the degree of Doctor of  
Philosophy

QUEEN MARGARET UNIVERSITY

2014



## **Abstract**

The thesis studies the female voice in the local culture in the post-devolution dramatic adaptations of the Scottish Makar Liz Lochhead. It acknowledges the dramatist's idiosyncratic approach of fusing poetry and drama in order to question the new internationalist national model in Scotland resembling the main features of anti-colonial nationalisms post 1990s.

Central to the thesis is the question of local female voice in the current national debate and whether and to what extent it problematizes the relation between feminism and nationalism in the new civic model introduced after devolution as an internationalist in Scotland. Lochhead's idiosyncratic voice of a poet and dramatist is interpreted as a non-feminist and non-nationalist with a specific focus on individualised female dramatic representations.

The complex semiotic interpretation of the constructed dramatic images by the playwright in her post-devolutionary adaptations of the classics shows a problematic reading of gender difference as cultural identity which appears with distorted features in the political revisions laden with self-satire. She applies metonymic use of female characterisation in order to reflect upon the changes in the cultural, political and linguistic climate, which results in a shift from a post-colonial dramatic discourse to a socio-linguistic one in the understanding of Robin Lakoff about a highly politicised and performative language and identity. The female voice in the local culture is frequently silenced and partially invisible, thus excluded from the political/national debate. However, Lochhead's subject often re-asserts itself through silent resistance and body visibility to refer to the instability of male political voices and sometimes to ironize their lack of individual identity.

Keywords: Scottish Devolution, Liz Lochhead, abjection, the semiotic and chora in Julia Kristeva's theory, anti-colonial nationalism, post-colonial drama, language war, postfeminism, post-dramatic theatre, feminist aesthetics.

## **Acknowledgements**

I would like to thank Dr. Ksenija Horvat for her enthusiasm, encouragement, constant support and professional help as my Director of Studies. I am indebted also to Dr. Richard Butt, my second supervisor and currently Dean of the Department, for his patience and invaluable advice. A huge thank you for the provided assistance goes to the librarians at Queen Margaret University, the University of Edinburgh (The Special Collections Department) and the Scottish Theatre Archive at the Glasgow University. I am very grateful to all the artists that agreed to be interviewed and their answers to be used in the thesis: director Graham McLaren (theatre babel) and Mike Duffy (Edinburgh Arts Theatre) and actors Lucianne McEvoy, Alison Peebles, Maureen Beattie, Lorna Dixon, Caroline Devlin and Louise Bolton.

I would like also to thank my parents for their love, support and belief in me and my wonderful colleagues and friends who never refused to share a meal and occasional glass of wine and help me enlighten any random Ph.D. blues. I am eternally obliged to all others who managed to challenge me professionally and personally and contributed to the development of the current project.

## Contents

Abstract.....	i
Acknowledgements.....	ii
Contents .....	iii
Introduction.....	1
Chapter One .....	10
Scottish National and Cultural Identities and the Role of Indigenous Theatre ..	10
Chapter Two .....	41
Nation, Myth and Identity in Scottish Theatre and Drama.....	41
Chapter Three .....	67
Adaptations of the Classics for the Scottish Stage and the Voices of Lochhead	67
Chapter Four .....	98
Contemporary Cultural Identities and the Abjected Feminine in <i>Medea</i> and <i>Thebans</i> .....	98
Chapter Five.....	152
Scots in Performance and Post-colonial Female Bodies in <i>Educating Agnes</i> and <i>Miseryguts</i> .....	152
Chapter Six .....	191
Between Carnival and Paranoia: Unbearable Identities in Lochhead's Adaptation of <i>Three Sisters</i> .....	191
Conclusion .....	228
Appendix.....	252
Literal translation of <i>L'Escole des Femmes</i> by Ajay Stephen .....	252
Endnotes.....	289

## Introduction

The Scottish Parliament re-established after devolution in 1999 revived nationalistic interests in Scotland. The new autonomous state searched for artistic expression of the contemporary cultural climate. Theatre and the political potential of the classics were seen as a rich medium for cultural revisions. Glasgow offered a variety of contemporary readings of Greek tragedies. Theatre Babel's project *The Greeks* in 2000, supported and funded by the Scottish Government, commissioned three established Scottish playwrights to produce their versions of *Oedipus*, *Medea* and *Electra*. David Greig, Liz Lochhead and Tom MacGrath offered distinct authorial versions. The same year, a new *Antigone* targeting younger audiences was performed by Glasgow's TAG theatre. Two years earlier, Maureen Lawrence's new translation of the same Sophocles' play was popularised by the Communicado Theatre Company. In all of these classical re-visions Scotland took a central cultural position, as opposed to its previously favoured marginalised national image. The Traverse Theatre in Edinburgh and its new generation of established and emerging directors built a forum for cultural discussions. David Greig (*The Speculator* 1999), Peter Arnott (*A Little Rain* 2000), Iain Heggie (*King of Scotland* 2000), Sue Glover (*Shetland Saga* 2000) and Zinnie Harris (*Further than the Furthest Thing* 2000) are just a few of the involved playwrights. The new writings of the Traverse group were shown in an eclectic topical showcase where the dominant ideas were about national responsibility and maturity. Similarly to many of these contemporary local dramatists, Liz Lochhead took an active part in the cultural revision after Devolution. She produced an alternative version of Chekhov's *The Three Sisters* for the Lyceum Theatre in 2000 that followed her artistic path of adaptation from a female point of view. From this period onwards, Lochhead has grown to be a culturally important figure, opening the fourth session of the devolved Scottish Parliament with a recitation of her verse, "Open". Due to the performance success and popularity of her *Medea*, she was asked to write a contemporary Scottish-flavoured version of *Thebans* in 2003. Prior to this, her love for Molière and his rich and dark humoured comedies inspired her to rewrite *The Misanthrope* in a completely contemporary Scottish setting, touching upon painful political topics. Lochhead further participated

in the debates for the founding of a national theatre, which resulted in the 2006 launch of the Scottish National Theatre (SNT). A year later, in 2007, an important political event stirred further the national debates: The Scottish National Party, for the first time in Scottish history, won the Scottish Parliamentary elections. The old rhetoric about Scottish independence was reinforced with the policies of the new government, which encouraged the acquisition of local languages like Gaelic and Scots, and started a project for a Scottish Referendum, which has now been scheduled for September 2014. The appointment of Lochhead as Scots Makar (National Poet for Scotland) in 2011 further increased her cultural engagement with the community and attracted strong public attention to her work as a poet and dramatist. This project aims at studying the role of Lochhead within the context of the national debate after devolution looking at the idea of strong cultural ties and an interest in reflecting the contemporary cultural climate.

This thesis studies and evaluates the post-devolution dramatic adaptations of classical European plays into Scots by the Scottish playwright and poet Liz Lochhead from two perspectives: firstly, that of the relationship between national debate in Scotland and dramatic representation, and secondly, theatre performance of Scottish gender and culture. It identifies the relationship between representations of national and cultural identities in dramatic adaptations as a complex model of reflecting upon and demythologizing the current national and cultural identity stereotypes in Scotland. This has been undertaken through analysis of the female characters in terms of theatrical traditions, performance, genre and language, and as a development of the national model of identity debate offered by the author prior to devolution with her reading of the historical figure of Mary Stuart. The thesis also discusses and reevaluates the role of the playwright's staging of Scots language in the adaptations and its relation to the main subject. The study further identifies the playwright's contributions to the field of theatre adaptation in relation to the established Scottish literary and dramatic traditions.

The rationale behind the choice of a playwright sits within the fact that Lochhead offers an idiosyncratic female and cultural reading with her adaptations, which often

goes beyond the dramatic and populist, regardless of the dramatic and popular linguistic media she applies. Literary critics regularly identify the discourse of gender and cultural identity in the work of Lochhead. Her plays have been frequently studied either from the perspective of gender/gender-related issues, i.e. feminist approaches (Scullion, 2000; Varty, 1993; Harvie, 1993; Horvat, 1999; Horvat, 2005), or as a contribution to the cultural and national identity discourse (Stevenson, 1996, 2004; Brown, 2000; Cole, 2007). This, however, does not completely reveal Lochhead's place in Scottish literature and drama. On the one hand, as a feminist writer, her works have been studied within the Anglo-American feminist theoretical framework, which often identified her as a British rather than Scottish playwright. On the other hand, as a nationalist, her works are studied from the perspective of cultural contribution exclusive of her feminist agenda (Carter, 1995). Scholars like Marilyn Reizbaum and Stephanie Lehner, introduce the subject of feminism and nationalism in post-colonial Britain and Ireland as part of the gender and other social group marginalisation discourse and as a direct result of such readings of cultural identities. The focus on Lochhead's dramatic adaptations allows for these two identities to be approached and analysed in terms of literary and political importance. These plays impacted on the establishment of a national theatre tradition in which the voice of a female writer enters the male dominated Scottish literary canon, and the establishment of a female voice against dominant political hegemonies in the playwright's contemporary society. It is necessary to have a woman's voice in the national debate in the context of post-colonialism. As Lehrner claims: 'the Scottish national question led to the silencing of individual and communal identity politics, i.e. under the privileged category of the national ultimately resulting in a collective sublimation of the nation's heterogeneity in terms of class and gender' (*Subaltern Ethics in Contemporary Scottish and Irish Literature: Tracing Counter-Histories*, pp.7-8). As part of this discourse, the thesis questions the political and feminist allegiances of the playwright in order to identify the artistic position of Lochhead on the cultural scene.

The main hypothesis of the study is that Lochhead is neither nationalist, nor feminist. Her interest in culture and gender stereotypes and their demythologisation through



various feminist techniques is often seen as approximating and sharing the beliefs of the second wave of feminists who perceive femininity defined by sexual difference. She supports the idea that sexuality is socially constructed. How culture becomes important to her and the cultural and class images along with the dramatic devices for misrepresentation (detachment, irony, etc.) help her build upon this idea. As a Scottish poet her poetic devices are presented in dramatic form that, in theory and practice, means that her characters are based on psychological identification. The same approach is further applied by the playwright in her dramatic work, to which she adds the concept of sexual difference as a replacement of the cultural difference argument in the male national debate. The so-defined dramatic subject corresponds to Julia Kristeva's theory about the split speaking subject in *Revolution in Poetic Language* (1984) and is used as a main analytical framework. Although Lochhead analyses sexuality in relation to patriarchal structures, she does not support the idea of female suppression. She introduces the question of male dominance with the idea of undermining it. What governs her work is the construction of sexual desires on the level of individual subjectivity – i.e. heterogeneity of gender and class with a reflection on the new national model of identity after the 1990s in Scotland.

The thus defined subject dictates the playwright's choice of dramatic works – all adaptations of classical plays into Scots from the European theatre tradition. Between 1985 and 2008 Lochhead adapted three of Molière's plays (*Tartuffe* in 1985, *Miseryguts* in 2002 and *Educating Agnes* in 2008), two Greek classical plays after Euripides and Sophocles (*Medea* in 2000 and *Thebans* in 2003), *Three Sisters* after Anton Chekhov in 2000, and a version of William Shakespeare's *The Tempest* for a young audience in 1993, entitled *The Magic Island* (performed by the Unicorn theatre in London and revived in 1995 by TAG). All of the adaptations listed above are included in this comparative textual and contextual analysis of themes (such as language, identity and sexuality in constructing female characters and their experiences) in the processes of adaptation applied by Lochhead.

This qualitative research project applies post-colonial feminist and cultural studies, socio-linguistic, theatre translation, post-dramatic and post-colonial drama theories to

study its subject. The dramatic subject - *female voice in the local culture* - in Lochhead's adaptations is interpreted with the overarching theoretical framework of Julia Kristeva's post-structural feminist theory of the speaking split subject, mainly discussed in *Revolution in Poetic Language* (1984). The thesis is informed by other theoretical works by the same critic and offers a rigorous analysis of the subject. The performance and transgressive techniques in the adaptations are interpreted with the help of post-colonial drama, post-dramatic theatre and feminist aesthetics. In the course of the project, the following methods are applied: theme identification, comparative contextual and textual analysis of the adaptations and the originals, interview preparation and conduct with the director of *theatre babel* and actors, and performance analysis. For the textual analysis of *Educating Agnes* a new literal translation from the French into English is used, prepared by a bilingual speaker, in order to identify new nuances of the original text, which Lochhead might have incorporated or omitted into the process of adaptation.

Chapter One introduces the national identity debate in Scotland as a process of constantly re-negotiated autonomies and defines dominant concepts of analysis in the national debate such as: colonisation, self-colonisation and internal colonisation. It follows the current discourses of Scottish nationalism as post-colonial with the critical works of the political and social scholarship of Michael Keating, David McCrone and Lindsay Paterson, as well as the post-colonial writing of Neil Lazarus and Richard Young. It further looks into the relation between cultural and political identities in Scotland and the formation of indigenous theatre with central focus of discussion on national theatre and the role of adaptations of literature and drama for the development of local national identity. The chapter also introduces the national model of the playwright, discusses evaluation and adaptation issues in the major theories of theatre translation and their proponents, and further specifies the particular approach of analysis to be applied for the subject of the thesis.

Chapter Two explores the questions of nation, myth and identity in Scottish theatre since its establishment in the early twentieth century and critically studies the current anti-colonial nationalism from the perspective of the old national dichotomous model

prior to devolution reflected in the dramatic works from the period. The new interpretations of the Scottish cultural identity as hybrid is further questioned in the works of Scottish playwrights produced after the 1990s. Lochhead's voices are also studied with the concept of the dominant national discourses prior to and after devolution and in relation to her artistic position within the national debate.

Chapter Three seeks to explore further the link between cultural and national identities in Scotland and the adaptations of European classics, such as Molière, ancient Greek playwrights, Chekhov, etc., for the Scottish stage, and compare and contrast them to the adaptation approach applied by Lochhead in the main framework of cultural performance. Special attention is given to the role of the adaptations of the French seventeenth century satirist Molière and the political voice of Lochhead's new Scottish versions of the French classics, together with the post-colonial readings of classical Greek and European texts on the global and local stages, all with reference to the national debate. The identified images of cultural identity are compared to and evaluated with the readings offered by the playwright, whose approaches to adaptation arguably offer a complete image of the national question in its complexities and specifics, in which language and performance play equal parts.

Chapter Four analyses the subject as the abjected feminine in the adaptation of Greek tragedies after 2000. *Medea* and *Thebans* offer a contemporary reading of cultural identity in Scotland with central importance of the woman question in relation to Kristeva's approach of sexual difference. It further questions the cultural hybridity image of the Scottish society as multicultural and open, with the character of Medea as a foreigner. *Thebans* reflects upon the aspect of internal colonisation and the national rhetoric of the cultural exile as problematic reading of the new hybrid cultural identity. Further to the critical analysis, the interpretation of the plays is informed with the points of view of director Graham McLaren from theatre babel and actresses Maureen Beattie (*Medea*) and Lucianne McEvoy (*Antigone*).

Chapter Five studies Lochhead's post-colonial versions of Molière's plays *Educating Agnes* (2008) and *Miseryguts* (2002) with reflection on body politics. The increased visibility of the colonised body and the highly performative function of Scots allow the playwright to discuss, not only cultural topical issues, but also to comment on feminist ideologies with the analytic tools of psycholinguistics.

Chapter Six explores Lochhead's interpretation of *Three Sisters* as an attempt to analyse the question of cultural imperialism as part of the national debate and its relation to gender and class. It discusses the issues of colonisation, self-colonisation and internal colonisation as complex class formations represented via the old linguistic contrast between English and Scottish expanded with American neo-colonial aspirations of the upper class members. The discourse of gender difference (read as sexual in the theory of Kristeva) is further enhanced with the discourse of dramatic representation as a gap between language and body, which are set into play/performance with the help of post-dramatic techniques by the playwright.

The proposed research approach allows for a thorough exploration of the playwright's works, encompassing feminist and national points of view in order to provide a more balanced argument. It also leads to a deeper understanding of the artist's style and writing techniques and defines the specific language and imagery she employs as idiosyncratic features of her adaptation works. It provides a tool for analysis of other, creative works by the poet and dramatist bound by the same themes and serves as an evaluative tool for other creative works by the same author, which are not directly related to the themes of culture and gender. The suggested approach throws further light on the connection between post-colonial nationalism and feminism in the specific Scottish context after devolution. This could be further applied by scholars in other contexts to develop the post-feminist discourse about the disadvantages of the establishment of anti-colonial nationalism as a current and dominant nationalist discourse on the global scale. One of the weaknesses of the suggested approach is that it is theoretically based on a small number of scholarly works that study the woman question and the post-colonial marginalisation incurred by the dominant nationalist discourses in the context of post-colonial Britain. The

same further links Irish to Scottish experiences and defines closeness in Celtic imagery applications. The study tests the validity of these applications by analysing all published and unpublished adapted texts of Lochhead and introduces further readings of the playwright's imagery and literary and dramatic interpretations based on her previous poetic works. Due to the idiosyncratic nature of the national model applied by Lochhead, its validity for the analysis of other female and male dramatists' work in Scotland may be questionable. A further study of adaptations of the classics by other, both male and female, playwrights in Scotland with the same theoretical framework could, however, prove fruitful for the development of the current national debate and contribute to the discourse about the role of theatre and women in theatre in post-devolutionary Scotland.

The study acknowledges the complex reading of the current political and cultural context in Scotland as post-colonial. Each chapter contributes to the central national debate by questioning and informing the dominant national discourses of colonisation, self-colonisation and internal colonisation through analysis of Lochhead's linguistic, poetic and dramatic choices for the female characterisation in each play. Then those choices of the playwright as an adaptor and supporter of feminist aesthetics inform the performed idiosyncratic functions of gender, class and cultural identities reflected in the main hypothesis of the study. Along with gaining understanding of how the playwright develops these central ideas in each of her adaptations after devolution, the outcomes of the study contribute to the further debate about the role of theatrical adaptations in the Scottish national question. It also reflects on the role of women and theatre in the current national debate, and develops the political significance of adaptations of the classics, not solely as a cultural reflection, but also as a valid instrument for introducing a political/post-colonial critique. This study acknowledges the playwright as a significant presence in Scotland and her contribution in the development of the comic theatre tradition in the country.

In conclusion, *Undoing Scotland after the Devolution in Liz Lochhead's Dramatic Adaptations of Classical Texts on Page and Stage* is an interdisciplinary study of the artistic interpretations of the national debate question in post-devolution Scotland in

Lochhead's adaptations of classical plays from the European canon for the Scottish stage. It seeks to identify the reading of the national debate question as post-feminist critique of the current post-colonial discourses of nationalism in the Scottish political and cultural landscape post 1990. It does not, however, limit their interpretation strictly to the post-feminist critical concept of breaking the gender/sex identification. The presence of Lochhead's voices spoken through her female characters problematise the patriarchal social roles prescribed to women and further reflect cultural images as internalised by female members of the society in the new, post-colonial context. Thus, the artist provides an idiosyncratic, ironic and self-critical commentary on the established cultural and gender stereotypes, and attempts to strip away their mythological garments. Lochhead shares the beliefs that identity in general is socially constructed, and as such, she equally attacks the dominant nationalist and feminist trends and their interpretations of gender and culture as marginalisation practices. She writes within the established traditions, both literary and theatrical, in order to offer a subversion from within the power matrix; an approach mentioned by Anne Varty in her study of the dramatist's early works. Such an approach results in a tendency for formal transgression which, in the case of Lochhead, is manifested in the play between language and performance and in pendulum movements from performative function of language, to non-verbal/chora defined performance and dramaturgy governed by feminist aesthetics.

The next chapter seeks to analyse the nationalist debate in Scotland and its developments and links with post-colonialism. It studies the role of theatre in the national debate and the influence of Lochhead's artistic and critical voice as a poet and adaptor.

## Chapter One

### Scottish National and Cultural Identities and the Role of Indigenous Theatre

The chapter studies the interpretations of national and cultural identities in literature and theatre in Scotland with relation to the development of national models within two theatrical trends: the emergence of an indigenous theatre tradition<sup>1</sup>, and the establishment of the National Theatre of Scotland. The national and cultural identities of Scotland are seen as inextricable from each other, in a process of constant re-negotiation of autonomies and definitions since the Act of Union in 1707. The dynamics is formed by the tensions between two major forces pro- and against the political settlement, expressed in unionist and nationalist views.

Lochhead's use of poetic and dramatic voices is introduced as part of the traditions of literary and dramatic adaptation for cultural re-definition and as the building forces of the playwright's national model. The same model is further applied for the evaluation of the dramatic adaptations by the author with respect to the current evaluation issues in theatre adaptation and translation studies. The analysis follows a specific feminist angle of revision for which Julia Kristeva's semiotic theory of the speaking subject has been found most useful due to the applied by the playwright traditional psychological approach to the subject.

In the 1950s Molière became very important to the Scottish, who, for the first time in history, watched the performances of *Tartuffe* and *L'Impromptu de Versailles* by Comedie Française, and Louis Jouvet's version of *L'Ecole des Femmes* (Peacock 1993, p. 5). Significantly enough, in the spirit of the *mise-en-scene* theatrical trend in the century, the performances by Jouvet and Vilar in 1947 and 1954 in Edinburgh showed new emphasis on the comic potential of the plays. In order to produce a more grotesque presence on stage these plays incorporated commedia dell'arte influences with borrowings from music hall, clowning, farce, etc. (Findlay 2003, p. 66). Namely that performance format struck Robert Kemp who found similarities between the Scottish comedians, trained in the panto and music hall traditions, and the French commedia dell'arte actors. Furthermore, during 1950s and 1970s the most prominent

Scottish actors comedians are Duncan Macrae and Rikki Fulton, both of whom give life to Molière's monomaniacs. Fulton's performances turn Molière into a non-elitist entertainment (Peacock 1993, p. 8).

Kemp's decision to introduce Scots in theatre is political in the sense that it enhanced the development of indigenous theatre by introducing the comic and linguistic literary traditions in drama. The use of Scots language in Scottish literature up to that time was seen as a means of political and cultural resistance usually presented into a comic and/or lyrical form. Kemp further revives the nationalist sentiments of the Scottish Renaissance agents (MacDiarmid in 1920s) through his project for a national theatre. The choice of Molière's plays as a source for national identity reflection is governed by the comic potential both in its cultural and linguistic form often interpreted as a historical link and a consequence of the Auld Alliance between Scotland and France. Furthermore, supporters of this historical legacy would see not only a linguistic proximity between French and Scots but also a cultural closeness between Scottish and French humour. It is arguable if Kemp's interpretation incorporated such views. The most significant feature that inspired Kemp was the performance format of the modernised versions of Molière's plays he watched in Edinburgh at that time. The performance style resembled the music hall and the British pantomime acting of the Scottish actor which further confirmed Kemp's belief that Scottish theatre has never stopped existing but lowered to the forms of popular entertainment dramatic forms.

Opponent to such a view is Bill Findlay who claims that Commedia dell'Arte has not been officially known and practiced in Scotland. Albert Mackie, in *The Scotch Comedians* (1973), gives an exhaustive account of old and new comedy narratives and figures on the Scottish stage. Mackie includes a wide range of styles and traditions of folk drama, e.g. the guisers and National Drama, based on the dramatisations of the narrative works of Sir Walter Scott in the nineteenth-century. Similarly to Kemp, Mackie also believes that Commedia dell'Arte has been preserved and further developed in the Christmas pantomime and music hall performance styles. Those styles gave birth to a myriad of commedia characters: the satiric comedian dressed in a kilt, the character comedians, and clowns. Moreover,



Fulton's contribution described by Peacock and mentioned earlier in the chapter, speaks of an old tradition of cultural appropriation of non-indigenous theatrical traditions into Scottish popular drama.

Kemp's *Let Wives Tak Tent* (1948) is a domesticated version of *L'Ecole des Femmes* in prose. It follows closely the original but is set in the Scottish capital and all characters appear with Scotified names. Kemp's traditional Scots of eighteenth-century intersperses with literary Scots, which sometimes resembles costume Scots. However, his language does not always comply with the modernistic formula for synthetic Scots because his main concern, along with the performability of the text (Findlay 2003, p. 67), is also to preserve Scottish humour (Findlay 2003, p. 92). Therefore, he introduces more physicality on stage. In the view of Findlay, one of the problems for English-speaking audiences, versed in the action-packed theatre of Shakespeare, is that most of the physically-expressive moments of *L'École des Femmes* occur off-stage and are conveyed through a series of narrations (*récits*) by Agnès and Horace. Kemp retains all the *récits* and soliloquies but lets the audience witness Agnès throwing a stone at her young lover and the latter climbing the ladder and falling, etc. (Findlay 2003, p. 90). Kemp also experiments with stage setting (a dramaturgical device developed by Jouvett): Molière's unidentified outdoor topography in *L'École des femmes* ('*la scène est une place de ville*', e.g. 'the scene is set in a village place') is changed to a house on the Canongate (a residential district at the foot of the Royal Mile in late seventeenth-century Edinburgh), with a garden that can be opened and closed at will. While Kemp's scenes take place outdoors, the frequent lifting of walls, indicated in the stage directions, allows the audience to see what is happening inside the house and in the garden. Jouvett had already developed the idea (first introduced in the nineteenth-century) of a garden on stage to give greater plausibility to the intimate scenes between Arnolphe and Agnès. Kemp exploits the broader scenic perspective to provide more action on stage (Findlay 2003, p. 89).

For *L'avare* (*Laird o' Grippy*), Kemp employs more specific and historical setting by preserving the original humour in the play: '*en ces quartiers*' and '*pas loin d'ici*' become 'up by the Lawnmarket' (part of the Royal Mile in Edinburgh's Old Town);

*'aller dans d'autres lieux'* (literally 'to go to other places') is rendered 'to flee away to London'. The Scottish setting entails consequential emendations in the recognition scene. The *'désordres de Naples'* (The disorders/riots in Naples, which took place in 1647) are transposed to the Highland Jacobite Rising of 1715 (Findlay 2003, p. 89). Here Kemp continues the literary tradition of creating historical links reflexively, which sets the grounds for the development of historical plays later as the dominant mode of cultural self-assertion in the 1960s and 1970s.

In the view of Peacock (1993), one of the important factors for the great success of Molière in Scotland in the 1940s was that it had never been performed in Scotland before. A similarly important factor is the emergence of repertory companies interested in serious drama like the Citizen's Theatre in Glasgow and the Gateway Theatre in Edinburgh (Peacock 1993, p. 6). In Kemp's view playtexts into Scots would contribute both to advancing indigenous theatre and to keeping the Scots language vigorously alive (Findlay 2003, p. 71). Behind Kemp's attempts lurks the idea of establishment of a national Scottish theatre in Edinburgh similarly to the Abbey Theatre in Dublin (Findlay 2003, p.72).

This agenda for a national theatre starts a few decades earlier with the founding of the Glasgow Repertory Theatre in 1914 but has been interrupted by the world wars in the period. The early 1920s witness a new social upheaval with the emergence of a cultural and literary project for Scottish Renaissance. Compared to Europe, this nationalist project is not only belated, but also interrupted by the breakout of WW1. The introduced ethnic nationalist debate aimed at a reformation of the existing model of split identity between British/English and Scottish (removal of the English part) in order to bring integrity. Geddes and MacDiarmid share aspirations for the Celtic storytelling, the enormous influence of Yeats and the Irish theatrical movement, and support left political views. In strife for European essentialism, they focus on inventing common history and language which further extends the ironic gap between fiction and reality and deepens the sense of nostalgia. One of the major contributions of the Scottish Renaissance agents is the use of Scots (a synthetic form called Lallans) as a form of political opposition and cultural belonging and the

founding of a contemporary identity on the basis of popular and folkloric sources and traditions.

The interrupted nationalist debate is revived again in the 1940s. Kemp and his colleagues at the Gateway Theatre in Edinburgh expand MacDiarmid's project with a project for a national theatre. It is inspired by two important events. Firstly, in the late 1940s and in the 1950s, Miles Malleston creates performable texts in English, in particular *The Miser* (1950), *The Slave of Truth* (1957) after *Le Misanthrope*, *The School for Wives* (1954), *Tartuffe* (1950), *The Prodigious Snob* (1952) and *The Imaginary Invalid* (1959). Malleston retains the original plots and settings but applies a modern idiom and sharpens the central traits of the characters in order to give greater comic emphasis (Peacock 1993, p. 9). The second important event is the already mentioned performances of Jouvet and Villar in 1950s. Both of these events would have probably had an equally strong influence on Kemp.

Scholars like Randall Stevenson and Femi Folorunso claim that *Scottish theatre is a belated modernist creation and its tradition is established primarily as a debate over national identity* (nineteenth-century nation-state approach). Although the first Scottish theatrical appearance is registered after the First World War in 1914 with the founding of the Glasgow Repertory Company, it is not until the 1970s when the Scottish theatre receives its complete shape. The period is referred to as 'theatre revival' by Stevenson (1996) in the sense that it witnessed new Scottish playwriting which either divorced its literary donor, or blended literature with drama. A big share of these new writings for the stage consisted of postmodern readings of Scottish history by looking at either small narratives or deconstructing grand narratives.

Folorunso claims that between 1920s and 1980s eighty per cent of all plays created and performed on the Scottish stage were historically bound – a mode which does not aim at 'construction of history per se' but deals with 'constructing of the self in history' (Folorunso 1999, pp. 97-109). Following historical logic and European experiences this process should have ultimately led to the establishment of a national theatre. However, the National Theatre of Scotland (NTS) emerged thirty odd years later as a political decision and as a result of a national debate with leading artists.

The NTS's first project 'Home' aimed at a contemporary and fragmented reflection of the nation locally. It is deliberately deprived of history and tradition and imported as a new, progressive looking model (different, more egalitarian and democratic than the National Theatre in London), as opposed to the backward looking national drama in Scots, which, supported by the nationalist group at the time, had won more negative sentiments with its narrowed focus on anachronistic linguistic forms. In other words, the NTS is designed to match the needs of the nation as a building-less, non-institutional repertory theatre.

However, if the Scottish do not target the recreation of history per se, then the creation of historical self is an instrument for social consolidation or the creation of community identity. The radical revision of national identity is intensified with the cultural images in theatrical adaptations of Molière's plays as a social satire of the contemporary society and its makeup in the 1980s. Those adaptations bring further aspirations to the nationalist debate and strengthen the sense of national identity in the 1990s, a period which marks another local and global change, namely, the collapse of communism as the main opponent to capitalism and the end of the nourished by left wing political system ethnic nationalism sentiments.

In Scottish 'historiography, as suggested by Paterson (1994), the past is instrumentally applied by the recurrent nationalist rhetoric of lament or loss (moreover, radical politics is fond of mobilising the past as utopia). However, such are the ways, in the opinion of the same critic, that the Scottish civil society manages to resolve its internal social and political tensions for itself" (Paterson 1994, p. 180). Whether the same social mechanisms stay valid in post-devolution Scotland or not is discussed in the next chapter.

The radical revision of national identity through historical images is intensified by the cultural images in the adaptations of Molière's plays in the 1980s. The adaptations serve as a mirror for social satire of the contemporary society and the undercurrent Thatcherite political and economic reforms. Those adaptations bring further aspirations to the nationalist debate and the rhetoric of cultural loss and strengthen the sense of national identity in the 1990s. In that period the new political

changes in Europe, namely, the collapse of communism, puts an end to the nationalists' ethnic sentiments.

Neil Lazarus and Richard Young consider the traditionalist European understanding of nationalism as short-sighted and incapable of explaining the emerging liberation movements post 1990s in the Third World as a direct result of post-colonialism (Lazarus & Young, p. 361). They use the term 'anti-colonial nationalism', an idea open to multiple ethnicities and embracing internationalism in a similar fashion to the civic nationalisms practiced in Scotland, Wales, Quebec and Catalonia in the same period. The multicultural and democratic post-welfare policy of the UK allows for the application of anti-colonial nationalism in Scotland as the post-devolution nationalism practiced within the country which shares the same concepts of nation-building and independence with the newly emerging post-colonial nationalisms. It also often accommodates nationalist with internationalist views and ethnical diversity (multiculturalism) as foundational.

However, Pittock argues that internationalism in Scotland is often perceived within the reduced scope of the concept of Britishness and often refers to the Scottish idea of equality between Scotland and England (2001, p. 56). John Corbett's attempt to describe the new Scottish identity after Devolution with this new post-colonial framework of analysis claims cultural openness and multiculturalism adapted to the old postmodernist model of dialogism (as a direct translation of the anti-colonial nationalistic theoretical foregrounding), which artists such as Lochhead, and critics such as Trish Reid, present as questionable.

Therefore, the images of Scottish identity in theatre after devolution are set on the borderline between the national and international. They aim at showing the dynamics of the emerging post-colonial form of nationalism in the 1990s, which reflects the social change in the political and economic structures in the country and the re-established Scottish parliament as a marker of political and cultural identity. The old dichotomy of unionists versus nationalists is replaced by internationalist and nationalist points of view. The same idea also refers to the death of Unionist Scotland, which in theatre is metaphorically presented as the death of the old stable male community of Docherty (working class values) and replaced with the

dichotomous image of the national and the international by the internationalists. E.g., not only is the community dying but the Scots language that is spoken by it is dying too. Similar setting is also applied in nationalist theatrical interpretations but with reformed or revived linguistic forms aiming at the decolonisation of the classics, i.e. de-anglicisation of the language in Scotland (MacMillan, Findlay, Corbett, Brown, Morgan).

Furthermore, in *Written in the Language of the Scottish Nation* (1999) Corbett argues that Scottish literary tradition is founded on translation and adaptation into Scots. He is a supporter of the dominant nationalistic idea of cultural imperialism whose opponent Joan Ure claims to have been an excuse to cover the cultural poverty of the Scottish in the 1960s (MacDonald 1999, p. 3). Stevenson and Brown support the idea that Scottish theatre too is founded on translation and adaptation of the classics in Scots, especially with the works of the French dramatist Molière in the 1980s. Calder does not dismiss the significance of adapting for the Scottish culture and views it as 'richly syncretic', which continues to borrow not only from the English but mostly from the European culture too (Calder 1997, p. 193). Witting compares Scottish literature and drama and concludes that there is no other European literature (and history) that could be described as 'intensely dramatic' as the Scottish and continues: 'Scottish poets are accustomed to enter into the minds of their characters and to see the world from their point of view' (1958, p. 312). He defines the Scots language and its ability of speaking in character as an 'inherently dramatic' tongue (1958, p. 312). This linguistic trait of Scots is further explored and developed by one of the prominent poetic feminist voices in Scotland in the 1970s.

Elizabeth Anne Lochhead appears as a novel voice in the poetic space of the period. She joins the prestigious writers' group initiated by Philip Hobsbaum and later is accepted in the group of talented writers such as Alasdair Gray, Tom Leonard and James Kelman. In contrast to the male members who actively participate into the process of decolonisation of language in poetry and prose by supporting the dominant urban working class voices, Lochhead uses her considerable talents in the exploration of female/feminist voices and identity which appear in her first collection of poems *Memo for Spring* (1972) and brings her recognition.

In a podcast (September 2012) for the Scottish Poetry Library, Lochhead discusses the subject of her appearance on the Scottish poetic stage. In her words, it was a pure luck, and also an interest in the works of a group of poets in the 1960 in Liverpool who reformed ideas of traditional poetry<sup>ii</sup>. The concept of reflecting on contemporary issues, performing the poetry out loud in search of a direct emotional impact, can be viewed as a major formative influence on the playwright's own style and theme choice.

Anne-Kathrin Braun-Hansen in 'Resignifying HiStories: The Subversive Potential of Revision in Liz Lochhead's Poetry' (2006) studies the artistic voice and poetic toolbox used by the writer to affect the reader's perception of female roles and identities:

her work seeks its place in the area of conflict between feminism and other political-philosophical movements. When Lochhead describes her project as an attempt "to retell familiar stories from another angle", she invokes the early feminist project of revision (Somerville-Arjat and Wilson 1990: 9). (p. 69)

Although feminist revision – telling old stories "from another angle" – can disrupt the power of a dominant narrative, it can, arguably, make change happen. One such widely known poem is "The Alternative History of the World, Part I", which is 'rewriting as negation' (2006, p. 70). It revisits the Book of Genesis, and the first part is dedicated to the Adam and Eve story:

There was this man alone  
In a beautiful garden.  
Stark bollock naked  
(Scuse my French, beg your pardon)  
[...]  
But there was Something Lacking ...  
He coudny put his finger on it,  
He was in a right tizz.  
But, the Lord our God being a Male God,  
He knew exactly whit it wis...  
A slave.  
And soon she was worn to a frazzle  
Waiting on His Nibs  
Ironing his fig leaves  
Barbecueing his ribs  
[...]

So they were both Ripe for Revolting  
When that Slimy Serpent came  
But – would you Adam and Eve it? –  
She got the blame. (Lochhead 1991, p. 12)

By applying parody which depends on the (distorted) intertext, Lochhead criticises and ridicules the clichés. Whereas the second part, “What-I’m-Not Song” is not a revision but rejection in a humorous voice.

I’m not your Little Woman  
I’m not your Better Half  
  
I’m not your nudge, your snigger  
  
Or your belly laugh. (Lochhead 1991, p.13) (2006, pp.71-72)

However, neither of the two poems create a true alternative history in the sense of giving an alternative historical account which in the framework of postmodernist revisionist theories speaks of multiplicity of interpretations of history and problematises the subject of power revealed in language. The first part voices a strictly female interpretation of the classical myth and shows the oppressed female identity by gender further developed in the playwright’s works on stage as a main theme of female colonisation. The second part of the poem is not solely rejection but negativity too (the reaction of the semiotic towards abjection in the view of Kristeva), which sets up the beginnings of revolt against female silencing, presented in the form of a gendered nation discourse in the playwright’s adaptations of classical plays.

*The Grimm Sisters* (1981) is Lochhead’s third poetry collection which deals with revision of cultural stereotypes. It is a hallmark in her writing career as Lochhead shifts from autobiographical writing to persona-poetry:

All of them are subdivided into two parts: the first part reads like a present – day ‘comment’ or a free association on the tale, often adopting an autobiographical tone. The second part narrates the tale from modern, feminist and psychological perspective, but retains the fundamental elements of the plot. The conspicuous double structure and the combination of a personal, deeply concerned tone with a cynical, inverted summary of the tale... (2006, p. 73)



The same critic opines that this new voice is less concerned with psychological depth, and is suffused with irony and humour because for the author the inversion of point-of-view is never entirely serious. The new interpretation never offers a closed narrative, but always leaves new gaps, from which irony can arise; here Braun-Hansen offers a solely postmodernist interpretation of Lochhead's poetic voices. After *Devolution*, Lochhead's work distinguishes with a significant psychological depth due to the newly applied framework of post-colonial drama. Braun-Hansen's observation that Lochhead uses the source text not as "original", but as a *source* of constellations, figures and figurations in poetry, stays valid for her dramatic adaptations too. On a figurative level, a significant part of the collection *Dreaming Frankenstein and Collected Poems* deals with Lochhead's incessant fascination with monsters or the monstrous female identity as a displaced image of the Other, which never fits completely or is quite in place. The same theme the playwright continues to explore in her dramatic work too.

Lochhead's audience-conscious poetry embeds disruptive effects in a communicative situation that enhances their reception as instances of re-signification (replaced by Butler for performativity of sexuality). Often in Lochhead's poems, it is the *voice* through which a woman, especially the woman in a liminal position, defends herself, but this same tool also turns her into a human monster. The importance of re-signification of cultural narratives assists Lochhead in the subversion of gender roles and gendered intertexts. In more general sense, according to Braun-Hansen:

The refusal to fulfill roles and norms imposed by a dominant culture or gender can be a performative act, it can result in a new, or different, subjective identity. Such reconstructions of selfhood are particularly vital for groups whose identity is not firmly established in history; a literary praxis from a doubly marginalised viewpoint... (2006, p. 79)

Lochhead does not abandon her female poetic voice but doubles it further with a dramatic narrative of her plays. As a poet and dramatist, Lochhead introduces the female subject in the Scottish traditions of writing, as Margery McCulloch in *Women and Scottish Poetry* points 'Twentieth-century Scotland has not lacked women poets with Scots language writing ... but it was only *Memo for Spring* publication that one

can talk about anything approaching a female tradition in Scottish poetry' (2001, p. 58).

In 'Liz Lochhead's Poetry and Drama' (2000, p. 44) Aileen Christianson defines her voice as the one which forges ironies via a 'female-coloured as well as Scottish coloured' language. What interests Lochhead are the tropes of cultural myths of national history and gender, and their link with language and class. Gradually, with the constant deconstruction of those through the application of irony and demotic language, she manages to establish a complex female cultural identity whose postmodern fluidity is impossible to be reflected in a single descriptive image.

The deployment of feminist revisionist mythmaking techniques by the writer prior to 1990s receives different interpretations. Christianson looks at it as a process of self-reflection and self-establishment as female writer, i.e. 'forging identity of 'a Scottish and female, working class and contemporary writer' as she claims with her first poetry collection (2000, p. 41). Her female speaker is a literary (lyrical/dramatic) persona who multiplies into voices, standing for all of the women within the culture, and even universally. This fragmented identity is defined and studied by a lot of scholars who place the writer among the contemporary women writers defending the feminist cause, as Lochhead herself in an interview with Ian Brown (1984, p. 3) admits that she is 'interested in stopping the silence not in describing female oppression'. For Christianson, Lochhead's ironies aim at enacting and at the same time satirising the differences between gender, class and individuals. Anne Varty sees Lochhead as a defiant feminist writer who refuses to conform to the traditional genre paradigms, often heading towards formal transgression and 'provocative tone of ironic feminism' in order to subvert the cultural and gender stereotypes from within and offer a 'self-conscious analysis of nationhood'(1997, p. 641).

Stevenson views Lochhead's place central in the creation of dramatic tradition in Scotland. One of the main contributions of the playwright is her style of fusing poetry and drama. Christianson claims that 'dramatic poetry intersects with poetic drama', the same way Lochhead connects gender and cultural identity into a discourse (2000, p. 47). Marilyn Reizbaum finds the possibility for building such a discourse as a result of the nature of Scottish nationalism, which, by lacking in

physical struggle, requires subtlety projected on ‘primarily psychic and internalized sense of struggle and marginalisation’ and leads to an obscure connection between nationalism and feminism (1992, p. 182). For cultural studies scholars like Tom Nairn (1977) this connection has never been obscured – Scottish national identity has been equalled to an image of inferiorisation for two centuries as a marginalised, feminine and split nation from the point of view of the dominant culture. This notion of inferiorisation is proved wrong by Craig Beveridge and Ronald Turnbull (1989) and the most powerful of the cultural myths – Tartantry and Kailyard – refuted with the studies of scholars such as Cairns Craig and David McCrone. Craig (1979) points at the Referendum of 1979, then Scotland votes against its independence, as the climax of the discourse of Scottish nationalism. The Referendum led not only to detrimental political and economic consequences, but also produced a shattering effect on the weak Scottish cultural identity reflected further on in the literary works of Alastair Gray and James Kelman.

While nationalists view Scotland as feminine from outside, from inside, the cultural image is predominantly male (e.g. *The Hardman*, etc.). The split nature of the subject of Scottish identity leads to an ambiguous sense of belonging and displacement at the same time. Such cultural identity sentiments were reflected in many of the contemporary dramatic and literary works since the 1970s.

Lochhead’s appearance on the literary scene brings in a new, feminist, discourse into the existing cultural identity argument. From the point of view of an insider (internationalist), seeing that Scottishness is equal to maleness, Lochhead decides to give a voice to ‘the muted Scotswoman’. The name is given by Anne McManus Scriven (2004) in an essay on Margaret Oliphant, a nineteenth-century Scottish woman novelist. Oliphant tried to break the same silence a century before Lochhead. Scriven calls Oliphant’s discourse ‘gendered nation question’, which is a discourse that deals with the feminist position of Scottish women writers viewed as ‘the double knot in the peeny’<sup>iii</sup>, i.e. as experiencing marginalisation on two different levels – gender and nationality. The gendered nation discourse deals with the idea of the silenced voice of the female Scottish writers in general and in the national identity debate, in particular, which Lochhead has continued and expanded with her dramatic

work. After Devolution, the question of national identity oppression is not as visible as gender marginalisation, which is turned into a central theme in the dramatic adaptations by Lochhead.

Reizbaum applies the feminist reading of the gendered nation question in which the gender/sex difference is replaced with a race /ethnicity one. According to the same model, race is seen as the biological vs. the ethnic, or the socio-cultural component of the Western masculine nationalist ideology. Julia Kristeva is more radical and suggests de-politicisation of the female subject by offering the formation of new socio-economic transnational identity which does not demolish but subsumes nation and its traits, and geographically corresponds to the territory of Europe:

the urgent question on our agenda might be formulated as follows: What can be our place in the symbolic contract? If the social contract, far from being that of equal men, is based on an essentially sacrificial relationship of separation and articulation of differences which in this way produces communicable meaning, what is our place in this order of sacrifice and/or of language? No longer wishing to be excluded or no longer content with the function which has always been demanded of us (to maintain, arrange, and perpetuate this sociosymbolic contract as mothers, wives, nurses, doctors, teachers . . .), how can we reveal our place, first as it is bequeathed to us by tradition, and then as we want to transform it? (Kristeva 1981, pp. 23-24)

The answer to this question Kristeva gives in her essay *Stabat Mater* (1985) which deals with the semiotics of the female body in western culture. Undoubtedly, Kristeva constructs her argument on the basis of the symbolic, which in her case is the study of Christianity from the point of view of representations of femininity, or the maternal (a key concept). Lochhead's interpretation of femininity in the Scottish cultural context links the question of religion to sexuality as the cultural difference is introduced as sexual one. Moreover, Kristeva interprets the Lacanian concept of 'woman as the non-entity, which keeps patriarchal culture' (1985, p. 95) and develops it to the idea that it is the absent imaginary father. The latter idea applied to Scotland serves as an artistic image of the lack of political power and represents the culture with feminine features: fragile, symbolic, under constant threats from the feminine semiotic, which has to be eaten, discarded, negated or violated. In *Powers of Horrors* (1982), Kristeva ascribes to the paternal fragility an immediate relation to the abjected maternal body. The cultivation of abjection as art, particularly strong in

the 1980s and 1990s, was directly influenced by Kristeva's theory of abjection, which might have informed indirectly Lochhead's choice of an interpretative framework of the national question then (Kristeva 1981, pp. 99-100).

One of Lochhead's most critically acclaimed plays studying the connection between female identity and sexuality in the Scottish context is *Mary Queen of Scots Got Her Head Chopped Off (MQS)* in 1987. Its central theme is the complex relationship of women with power and the demythologisation of the narrative about the Scottish Queen and the discourse of betrayal. The figure of Mary Stuart is not only historically important to the Scottish but it is also of capital significance to the building of historical self. Mary Queen of Scots is the last Scottish royal before the Union of Scotland with England in 1707. The loss of power from the hands of a female queen, proficient in Scots, is turned into a cultural trope of a national/cultural loss by the Scottish nationalists. Furthermore, this 'national fall' could be metaphorically related to the biblical fall and the whole blame and responsibility thrown at Eve in the artistic revision offered by Lochhead in her poem.

Prior to the 1990s, the hegemonic portrait of the Scot in nineteenth- and twentieth-centuries that dominated the arts was dispersed with popular cultural images of tartanry and kalyardism<sup>iv</sup>, which Colin McArthur classifies as part of the 'Scottish Discursive Unconscious' (2003, p. 202). Along with it, the image of Scotland as a divided and ailing society is a common one in the Scottish literature, popular as 'The Caledonian Antisyzygy'<sup>v</sup> which acted as a carrier of Scottish identity for almost a century. The divided and feminised Scottish image is a Jacobite<sup>vi</sup> heritage.

The play *MQS* comes as collaboration with Communicado Theatre Group in Glasgow and is staged for the celebration of 400 years from the death of Mary Stuart. The play is political and contemporary with subtle criticism of Thatcherism, which is later denied as a theme by Lochhead in 2011 at its latest staging by the Royal Lyceum Theatre. Originally the play is devised as a 'people's play' and further stylised by Lochhead with the complexity of characterisation, e.g. Chorus La Corbie – a narrator and Brechtian techniques of performance, which at the time are 'innovative and exciting' in the words of Alison Peebles, a co-founder of Communicado with director Gerry Mulgrew and in the leading part of Elizabeth. The

two parts of the play resemble Lochhead's poetic structural preference for revisiting cultural myths – a historical and contemporary part in which the intertext is repeated but also resignified – in the second part all adult characters appear as children on a playground in 1970s Scotland and play a game. Some of the names of the participants are repeated (the male ones), whereas others are altered, e.g. Mary transforms into little Marie. *MQS* in the view of Stevenson (1996) responds to the long questioning of cultural identity by the Scottish audiences and appears as the national model of the playwright. As a follower of the literary and theatrical tradition of applying Scots, Lochhead uses the linguistic medium creatively in order to deconstruct the established cultural and gender stereotypes on stage.

An important aspect of theatre adaptation is its function as a cultural supplement, namely, the creation of national theatre tradition in which the playwright takes an active part (Aaltonen 2000). Aaltonen's model of productive reception<sup>vii</sup>, i.e. that in theatre translation the source text and its cultural identity importance is decreased for the benefit of the target culture, could explain the need of theatre translation into Scots of the classics as a means also to form/reflect upon a Scottish cultural identity. The medium of translation is appropriate for the Scottish as it is a means of assertion of cultural difference through the image of the Other and its cultural proximity to the self predominantly through linguistic contrast (British/English-Scottish). Later the contrast is replaced by linguistic similarities and use of the fantastic to refer to the constructed nature of language and through it to the whole concept of identity as socially constructed and political. In the 1960s and 1970s the Scottish have identified their culture with that of the Other (historical and cultural affiliations with the French culture – the Auld Alliance historical connections) and kept the contrast as a metaphor for cultural betrayal. Historically, the concept of cultural betrayal can be traced back to a moment of modernisation in Scottish society, i.e. in nineteenth-century Scotland the middle classes started to *free* themselves from 'history', 'for to be British was to be oriented to the future not the past' (McCrone 2001, p. 200). The notion about Britain being 'the present and the future' comes from the historical writings of Sir Walter Scott<sup>viii</sup>, who applies a complex model<sup>ix</sup> of what is going to become 'split identity' – he mixes terms from history, geography and psychology

and treats them interchangeably. In the view of the political scientist Paterson, the dual identity is an old nationalist belief of the middle classes in nineteenth-century, who were linguistically versatile and chose when to be Scottish and when – British. This dual cultural and political allegiance was experienced as the national right of the Scots to be treated as equal within the Union (Paterson 1994, p. 44). The same question interpreted from the modern point of view of colonisation and self-colonisation (partial colonisation), for Paterson, is a rhetorical paradox:

Scotland has not existed politically for a very long time and yet political rhetoric claims that its traditions are under uniquely serious threat and even more stranger is the recurrent rhetoric of loss throughout the entire period since 1707. (1994, p. 2)

The modern translators and adaptors after the 1980s and the 1990s not only reduced the contrast but also questioned the straightforwardness of the established model and brought a more complex view to the cultural identity debate thus confronting the inferred cultural betrayal.

Nationalist rhetoric continued to apply Scots language in translations as a means of introducing immediate political debate. Scholars like Katja Lenz, Ian Brown and John Corbett define Scots main function in translation as *political*, or, as Lenz claims, in general ‘Scots serves to transmit a feeling of specifically Scottish identity’ (Lenz 2009, p. 4).

Scots is a collective noun both referring to a family of dialects spoken in different regions of Scotland and various historical forms forged for the literary and theatrical spheres, e.g, Lallans (plastic Scots), general Scots, Doric etc.

Findlay’s thesis focuses on the translation/adaptation into modern Scots (1940s to 1990s) of plays from the historic repertoire of Continental European drama. He suggests the following varieties of Scots:

1. Urban or Demotic is the modern working class vernacular Scots of the Central Belt;
2. Traditional Scots is an older country Scots which has retained conservative features (e.g. Aberdeenshire Doric);

3. Synthetic/plastic/literary/classic Scots is the literary and classless variety of Scots which incorporates current features of traditional Scots along with anachronisms, neologisms and calques Lallans (a term coined by 1940s activists to represent a 'would be' national language, based on synthetic Scots);
4. Costume Scots is a synthetic form of Scots used in period dramas usually set in eighteenth-century and incorporates archaisms suggestive of the period, e.g. borrowed from the work of Robert Burns;
5. Scottish Standard English (sometimes Scottish - English) shares most features with standard English but is influenced by traditional Scots in pronunciation, vocabulary and grammar (2000, pp. 19-20).

Lenz studies the use of Scots in theatre by dividing the dialects into centre and periphery according to the geographical linguistic spread in the Central Belt (urban Glaswegian) and the 'peripheral' areas – the Borders, the North-east, the Orkney and the Shetlands, whose dialects are 'less attractive due to its density and conservativeness compare to the urban industrialised dialects' (Lenz 2000, p. 29). The main focus of contemporary playwriting in Scotland in those years fell on intelligibility. This explains how the new theatrical Scots, classified as 'ideal' by Lenz, was selected.

Historically there is no standard form of Scots. Lenz follows Aitken's study and claims that 'ideal' Scots plays the role of a modern literary quasi-standard:

Unlike the synthetic language created by the first 'wave' of the *Renaissance*, which is often called 'Lallans', 'ideal' Scots contains only few archaisms and neologisms, hardly any localised items from outside the Central Belt, and few socially marked words. Most Scots features belong to what is termed general Scots (cf. CSD) they are valid across all dialect regions of Scots and are not necessarily used but known by readers well versed in the classics of Scottish literature. (Lenz 2000, p. 30)

The lack of standard Scots has been both perceived as inferior to English (e.g. Findlay) and as an incomplete process of development by Corbett, according to whom Scottish identity is based on the idea of multiculturalism.



The emergence of 'ideal' Scots comes as a result of the effort of Scottish writers like Findlay, Ian Brown, Edwin Morgan, Bill Dunlop and others who consciously work with the idea of raising the status of Scots as part of the nationalist project. An opponent of the opinion about the lowered status of Scots is Derrick McClure, a Scots scholar, who considers the main prerequisites for such dominant notions the unfortunate linguistic proximity of the two languages. He also goes further to prove that poetic Scots is superior to English with its phonestaesic features. Those features definitely contribute to bringing more emotional and highly poetic expressions of translations of the classics, especially by Morgan in *Cyrano* and *Pheadra* and the adaptations of Molière's satires by Hector MacMillan and Liz Lochhead. However, the proximity of Scots and English could not be considered a disadvantage since on the one hand, it contributes to the higher intelligibility of the dialects of the Central Belt and guarantees a wider audience and presence on the British stage rather than on the local stages only. On the other hand, the dynamism between the languages allows for achieving more vibrant and visceral dramatic texts loaded with irony and humour, especially of Molière's plays.

Lochhead is not involved directly into this language debate since the stage Scots she develops is more informed by the accent rather than a Glaswegian dialect. Lindsay Paterson too studies the development of theatrical Scots and notes that 'Historical plays used a highly artificial form of older Scots; contemporary writing used at most Scottish accents' (Paterson 1996, p. 75). This trend comes as another influential linguistic model started with the works of Robert McLeish *The Gorbals Story* (1946), Ena Lamont Stewart's *Men Should Weep* (1947) and Roddy MacMillan's *All in Good Faith* (1954) who apply a modern urban working class idiom, which is supposed to 'imitate the authentic speech' (Lenz 2000, p. 30).

The most substantial tradition of dramatic works of all the 'peripheral' areas is written in the dialect of the North-east region due to a strong poetic tradition. Lenz suggests that Rona Munro as a native of Aberdeen and a speaker of Doric might be considered the first truly national figure in North-eastern playwriting' (Lenz 2000, p. 31). Plays in the Shetland dialect are much rarer, restricted to local performances with no written publication. The strong literary tradition of Caithness has produced

very little drama, an example is *Widows of Clyth* (1979) by Donald Campbell set in a small fishing village near Wick but the Scots is not authentic dialect, it only imitates the authentic melody (Lenz 2000 p. 34). The Border plays do not contain any localised language, for instance Sue Glover's *The Bondagers* (1991) sets the play in the area but the language she used as non-local is 'a slightly denser General Scots' (Lenz 2000, p. 36). Paterson views the work of such dramatists revivalist:

When dramatists such as Hector MacMillan, Tom McGrath, and Donald Campbell started writing in a Scots that could be felt to be real, they were contributing to that awakening of national self-confidence in the 1960s, 1970s, which has now thoroughly reinvented the national identity. (Paterson 1996, p. 75)

The same critic considers the role of these dramatists pivotal also in the shift of the Scottish conscience from the past to the present. Further to it, the Scots that is used went beyond social realism – it is often fused with the fantastical, e.g. John Byrne's trilogy, Donald Campbell's plays, and even Lochhead's early works such as *MQS* and *Tartuffe* have been included in this group of playwrights by Paterson (Paterson 1996, pp. 79-80). However, alongside the development of this type of Scots, Paterson claims that there was another, more serious use of Scots for intellectual topics (Paterson 1996, p. 81). For example, one of the first works in the 1970s to apply Scots for such purposes was Stewart Conn's play *The Burning*. Further followers were Campbell in *The Jesuit* (1976) and Lochhead in the portrayal of Mary and Knox in her play about the Scottish Queen. For Paterson, however, 'the supreme recent example' was Edwin Morgan's *Cyrano de Bergerac*, which contains 'a great variety of rhetorical registers – action, politics, religion...' (Paterson 1996, p. 81). In the opinion of the same critic, one of the biggest contributions of Lochhead in this movement for development of theatrical Scots is the application of registers. In this context, Lochhead treats identity as a non-straightforward/complex matter and offers an exploration of different identities 'available to women or to people from various ethnic backgrounds' (Paterson 1996, p. 79).

Lynda Mugglestone agrees with the view of Paterson on the importance of register for Lochhead and adds that very often the playwright views Scots as 'a language for multiplicity of registers and for the foregrounding of social, gendered and

geographical divisions' (Mugglestone 1993, p. 93). Moreover, Lochhead's Scots is based on the colloquial, urban, and demotic legacies of the present, which are described as the modern patter by Glaswegians (Mugglestone 1993, p. 96). And although in the view of David Murison it is 'a debased industrial variety which... can hardly be described as Scots' (Mugglestone 1993, p. 97), Mugglestone argues that it is exactly this language form that allows Lochhead to offer vigour, directness and vividness with her rendition of *Tartuffe*, for example. All these language features lack in the French original text in the view of H. Gaston Hall. Molière's art relies more on the ethical rather than the visual background of the vocabulary (Mugglestone 1993, p. 101).

The main framework of the thesis lies within the notion of dramatic adaptation as central to the study of national identities in post-devolution Scottish theatre. The term incorporates a couple of meanings, e.g. in theatre studies it is frequently used as adaptation of texts from all media into theatre (Morrissey 1994); in film studies it refers to film adaptations of plays which preserve the theatrical mode. The term dramatic adaptation in the current thesis is applied with the narrow meaning of cultural translation of a play into a play. As such, it serves as an intercultural dialogue, a position supported by Patrice Pavis in *Theatre at the Crossroads of Culture* (1992). Pavis is a theatre semiotician, whose work is largely influenced by the anthropological studies of Camille Camilleri and Claude Levi-Strauss. Pavis' main interest is to discover how theatres and cultures interact. For him, on the stage, culture affects every element of production and the intercultural theatre is one of the possible exchanges between theatres and cultures. He offers an extensive categorisation of relationships by taking into account not only the textual quality but also all possible aspects of production: dance, music, gestures, songs, masks, costumes, which could be described as '*mise-en-scene*'. Therefore, the process of translation for the stage includes not only the textual transposition of a play but also its dramaturgical choices usually applied by the director and Pavis focuses on the importance of *mise-en-scene* in the transition process, which is included as a method of study of the main subject.

The intercultural dialogue, in general, occurs on the basis of showing difference on stage in order to allow the reception culture to recognise itself in the similarities through difference. Pavis' model alters when the source play belongs to the classical drama heritage. On the one hand, most of the classical texts appear as models (Roman theatre mimesis), i.e. they are historically and to a great extent culturally de-contextualised, therefore the intercultural value is instantly turned into intracultural – a self-reflective function. On the other hand, the intercultural dialogue appears disrupted when the two cultures involved are not equal. That does not imply a hierarchy of cultures (superior vs inferior) but is an indication of differing stages of cultural development, a factor which is marginally discussed by Pavis.

The present study applies Sirkkhu Aaltonen's model of theatre translation according to which adaptation is a form of translation. This solves the ambiguous use of terms like *adaptation*, *translation* and *version* by Scottish playwrights (Findlay 2000). Lochhead herself is not an exception. She also uses *translation/adaptation* as a category. It becomes obvious that the reading she applies is that a *translation* is a work based on the use of the original text (in the original language) by the playwright and is *adaptation* when s/he uses translations of the original to produce a new variant in the target language. However, the term *translation/adaptation* is applied for *Tartuffe* by Lochhead who actually used the original text as a source.

Part of the difficulty in discussing adaptations for the theatre comes from the ambiguity of the term and the variety of possible nominations: translation, version, interpretation, dramatisation, which have never been clearly defined by Translation Studies scholars either. However, Theatre Translation is an interdisciplinary field studied by translation studies scholars, in particular the eminent scholarship of Susan Bassnett, and cultural/anthropological studies informing the semiotic approach of Pavis and Aaltonen. Although Translation Studies approaches the field from a strictly linguistic point, it soon, after the 1990s, shifted to trans-linguistic studies approximating the semiotic approach of translation as performance due to the complex relationship between text and performance. One of the points of disagreement between Bassnett and Aaltonen is the interpretation of the term 'adaptation'. Aaltonen argues:

The problem with the term adaptation is that despite its popularity its signification is unclear. Nevertheless, there is a need for a term to describe a translation strategy which does not translate the source text in its entirety but makes additions, omissions or changes to the general dramatic structure of its setting, plot and characters, thus suggesting new readings for it. (Aaltonen 2000, p. 45)

For Bassnett the term would imply a more radical difference from the source text (ST). For Aaltonen, theatre translation traditionally employs adaptation, which is a concept as old as the theatre itself. The term is applied not only to translations that make partial use of their ST but also to texts which comply with particular theatrical conventions not part of the literary system (Aaltonen 2000, p. 7). It is namely this particular use of 'translation' in the theatre of the English language that has led to a confusion of terms, so that the performance of a translated text into the target culture should be interpreted as 'a translation of a translation'. In the view of Bassnett, other theatres, for instance in French – the *mise-en-scene*, a specific term has been reserved to refer to the process separate from the translation, thus indicating differences in theatre traditions (1998, pp. 94-95). In her subsequent studies, Bassnett offers the term *performability* in order to evaluate theatre translations. The same term, according to the scholar, emerged at the same time as naturalist drama, and was consequently linked to ideas of consistency in characterisation and to the notion of the gestural subtext (Bassnett 1998, p. 95). For Pavis, though, the performability/speakability of the text is a 'simple criterion', which could be replaced by the notion of the 'language-body', as the convincing adequacy of speech and gesture (1992, p. 145). Pavis bases his theory on the works of the French directors Antoine Vitez, Claude Regy and Daniel Mesguich who consider every text playable. In this sense, each translator turns into a reader and dramaturge who integrates the *mise-en-scene*. Certain practitioners equal the *mise-en-scene* to the act of translation, whereas others, mainly those who consider their work publishable, do not accept *mise-en-scene* as part of the translation and leave the texts open to directors (1992, pp. 144-147). Pavis' interpretation of translation as language-body incorporates the notion of *mise-en-scene* to the extent that performance becomes a translation technique popular with the name 'translated gesture'. The gestic subtext central to the theory of Pavis is contested by Bassnett in her further studies of theatre

translation on the global stage. Bassnett applies Vicky Ooi's argument that in Chinese theatre the subtext is absent in order to conclude that performability/gestic subtext refers only to the conventions of the European theatre traditions (1998, p. 106). In her view the gestic subtext is an important methodological approach to the European theatre of psychological realism and is inapplicable to post-modernist or non-European theatre (1998, p. 107). While studying theatre translation in the context of post-colonialism, Bassnett suggests the term 'inter/cultural translation', a position also shared by Erika Fischer-Lichte in her theory of performance in which cultures are interwoven. Fischer-Lichte criticizes Pavis' theory of intercultural theatre and performance as limited/one-sided as it deals with:

... the transfer of non-Western elements into Western theatre is dealt with in the main body of research on so-called intercultural theatre. ... non-Western elements imported into Western theatre are given a different emphasis than the use of Western elements in non-Western theatre. While in the first case they are celebrated as bold aesthetic experiments, in the second they are generally seen within the purview of modernizations, which is largely equated to Westernisation (Fischer-Lichte 2009, p. 399).

Hence, on the one hand, since the focus of the current study is the theatre translations rooted in the European theatre traditions and conventions, the anthropological view of Pavis based on the semiotic notion of intercultural performance could be accepted as valid for the current analysis. On the other hand, Bassnett's view that Pavis' theory is applicable only to plays belonging to European psychological realism, the evaluation of theatre translation appears a contradictory issue for the current project. As defined earlier, Lochhead's adaptations belong to the group of post-colonial dramatic works and as such should be viewed as inter/cultural in the interpretation of Bassnett. However, the focus is strictly European, e.g. Kristeva's idea of transnationality. Moreover, Fischer-Lichte's study of European theatre and drama links theatre and identity and claims that 'the fundamental conditions of the very existence of theatre are to be found in the *conditio humana* as the distance of the self from the self', or that in its essence 'theatre thematises and reflects the de-centred position of man and the potential resulting from it' which corresponds to the already mentioned post-colonial reading of national identity in Scottish theatre as inter/cultural and the experienced decentralisation of the self (2002, p. 1).

Since translation and adaptation scholars are not unanimous about the application of evaluative tools in the process of analysis of dramatic adaptations and the existent link of the adaptations of the classical plays by Lochhead and the post-devolution national question in Scotland, the national model of the playwright *MQS* is applied as an evaluative tool. The choice is governed also by the fact that it is the most representable cultural identity reflection of Scottish experience before Devolution and takes a central part in the indigenous theatrical tradition. The play provides intricate relations between language, gender and culture with the national trope of Mary the Queen, mother of the nation, and as already mentioned, combines both female stereotypes identified by Kristeva through the various re-significations of female sexuality. *MQS* also is treated as the playwright's model of structuring and characterisation against which all adaptations under scrutiny are compared and evaluated. Furthermore, the play also supports Fischer-Lichte's concept of theatre as a cultural performance, per se in the Scottish context, which, in the view of the originator of the term, the American anthropologist Milton Singer in the 1950s, describes:

A place where culture could articulate its image of itself and its self-understanding and display this image before its own members and members of other cultures. (Fischer-Lichte 2002, p. 3)

In conclusion, the national question in Scotland since the Union in 1707 is a question of constant renegotiations of autonomies governed by the formative forces and tensions of two dominant and opposing rhetoric: unionist and nationalist, later transformed into internationalist and nationalist. Both views are shared by specific social class groups and reveal the political relationship and power negotiations within Scotland. Proponents of nationalist rhetoric believe in the loss of independence of the country and fight against social reforms frequently interpreted as acts of colonisation or self-colonisation (anglicisation) in the light of the modern theory of post-colonial nationalism. The ruling classes translate this theory into a desire for cultural assimilation which is a resisted 'cultural imperialism' on the grounds of the previously implied rhetoric of cultural difference. Such cultural interpretations, in the view of Lindsay Paterson, often utilise the past and lament the current political setting as a political or cultural loss. In Scottish literature, this radical rhetoric is

projected in the cultural image of the Caledonian Antisygyzy—a dominant perception of Scotland for over a century as divided and feminised. Such cultural images can be traced back to the Romantic writings of Sir Walter Scott and his complex model which introduced a dual identity of being both British and Scottish. The former is seen as the progressive and forward looking, and the latter—as the primitive and backward looking one. McArthur identifies such interpretations of the cultural self by the Scottish as part of the Scottish Unconscious Discourse. The recurring cultural difference nationalistic debate is supported by an influential group of Scottish writers, who provide an eclectic and syncretic cultural identity through constant adaptations in Scots. This tradition is further exploited in the pioneering work of Robert Kemp, who starts the process of establishment of national drama in the 1950s by combining the comic talents of the music hall Scottish actor and the translation into Scots of works of the French satirist Molière. The movement for establishment of national drama is revived in 1970s with the MacMolière family of plays together with the postmodernist revisionist writing of history and gender in the 1980s but since the emphasis is put more on the preservation of the linguistic medium than on expanding the dramatic form, the movement does not result in the creation of a national theatre. The NTS appears some thirty-odd years later as a product of the new national model of rhetoric, namely that of anti-colonial nationalism.

Liz Lochhead emerges as a poetic and feminist postmodernist voice in the 1970s with strong interest in performance poetry. Her poetic tools are viewed as re-signifying techniques of gender and cultural stereotypes, which from a certain point in her career, lose psychological depth and are based on heavy use of irony and parody. Lochhead later enters the theatrical scene and applies a specific idiosyncratic style of fusing poetry and drama including of the employment of a new stage Scots based on the newly formed trend for social realism with emphasis on Scottish accent rather than dialect. Faithful to her poetic approach, she continues to link the question of nationalism to feminism, looking at the cultural stereotypes from the perspective of female sexuality. It allows the playwright to produce a culturally complex image of contemporary Scotland with her version of *Mary Queen of Scots* in 1987 in which she further problematises the political situation of women in power and sheds light on the religious bigotry within the society which functioned as a cultural divide. This



cultural trope in the opinion of Marilyn Reizbaum reflects the cultural experience of modern Scots as an internal class problem but it also mythologises cultural difference as gender difference which, in the later adaptation of the classics by Lochhead, is presented as problematic via racial and ethnical readings of the national identity.

In general, Lochhead's work belongs to the literary and dramatic traditions in Scotland and offers new dramaturgical uses of demotic Scots as a means of introducing political debate, she deconstructs and questions with the help of adaptations of European classics (Patrice Pavis) in the form of a cultural performance of Scottish identity (Fischer-Lichte). Due to the discussed issues of terminology and evaluative tools in translation and anthropological studies, the works of the playwright are approached as translations in the theoretical study of Sirkku Aaltonen and evaluated via the constructed national image of Mary Queen of Scots with reference to the gendered nation question and its interpretation through the critical theory of Julia Kristeva.

## References:

- AALTONEN, S., 2000. *Time-sharing on Stage: Drama Translation in Theatre and Society*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- BASSNETT, S. and A. LEFEVERE, 1998. *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*. Multilingual Matters.
- BHABBA, H., ed. 1990. *Nation and Narration*. London: Routledge.
- BRAUN-HANSEN, A.K., 2006. Resignifying HiStories: The Subversive Potential of Revision in Liz Lochhead's Poetry In: MCGONIGAL, J. & K. STIRLING, eds. *Ethically Speaking: Voice and Values in Modern Scottish Writing*. Amsterdam, NY: Rodopi. pp. 69-86.
- BROWN, I., 1984. Interview with Liz Lochhead. *Interface*. (3).
- BROWN, I. and A. RIACH, eds. 2009. *Edinburgh Companion to Twentieth-Century Scottish literature*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- CALDER, A., 1997. By the Water of Leith I sat down and wept: Reflections on Scottish Identity In: RITCHIE, H., ed. *Acid Plain: New Scottish Writing*. Bloomsberry. pp. 218-238.
- Christianson, A., 2000. Liz Lochhead's Poetry and Drama In: CHRISTIANSON A. & A. LUMSDEN, eds. *Contemporary Scottish Women Writers*. Edinburgh.. pp. 41-52.
- CORBETT, J., 1999. *Written in the Language of the Scottish Nation*. Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data.
- CRAIG, C., 1966. *Out of History: Narrative Paradigms in Scottish and British Culture*. Edinburgh: Polygon.
- FETZER, M., 2012. Beyond the Textual Line: Walter Scott's Postponing and Postscripting of Authentic Scottishness In: *Post-colonial Europe*. vol.11, issue 2. Leeds: University of Leeds. pp. 86-90.
- FINDLAY, B., 1998. *History of Scottish Theatre*. Edinburgh: Polygon.
- FINDLAY, B., 2000. *Motivation and Method in Scots Translations, Versions and Adaptations of Plays from the Historic Repertoire of Continental European Drama*. PhD thesis ed. Queen Margaret University.
- FINDLAY, B., 2003. The Founding of a Modern Tradition: Robert Kemp's Scots Translations of Molière at the Gateway In: BROWN, I., ed. *Journey's Beginning: The Gateway Theatre Building and Company, 1884-1965*. Intellect Ltd. pp. 67-92.
- FISCHER-LICHTE, E., 2002. *History of European Drama and Theatre*. London, NY: Routledge.

FISCHER-LICHTE, E., November 2009. Interweaving Cultures in Performance: Different states of being in-between. *National Theatre Quarter*. Cambridge University Press.

FOLORUNSO, B., 1999. *No Place to Hide: Contemporary Scottish Theatre and Post-coloniality*. PhD thesis ed. University of Edinburgh. Special Collections database.

KRISTEVA, J., Autumn 1981. Women's Time. *Signs*. [online]. vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 13-35. The University of Chicago Press. [viewed 07 February 2010]. Available from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3173503>.

KRISTEVA, J., 1984. *Revolution in Poetic Language*. New York: Columbia University Press.

LAZARUS, N. & R. YOUNG. Post-colonialism In: *Post-colonial Studies* 46. p. 198.

LENZ, K., 2000. 'A 'Peripheral 'Problem?: the Use of Scots in Plays Set Outwith the Central Belt of Scotland. *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses*. Vol 41, November. Servicio de Publicaciones Universidad de la Launa. pp. 29-41.

MACKIE, A. D., 1973. *The Scotch Comedians, From the Music Hall to Television*. Ramsay Head Press

MALONEY, P., 2010. 'Wha's like us' Ethnic Representations in Music Hall and Popular Theatre and the Remaking of Urban Scottish Society In: BROWN, I. ed. *From Tartan to Tartanry: Scottish Culture, History and Myth*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. pp. 129-150.

MCARTHUR, C., 2003. *Brigadoon, Braveheart and the Scots: Distortions of Scotland in Hollywood Cinema*. London: i.b.Tauris & Co.

MCCRONE, D., 2001(1992). *Understanding Scotland: The Sociology of a (Stateless) Nation*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. NY: Routledge.

MCCULLOGH, M., 2001. Women and Scottish Poetry: 1972- 1999. Transforming Traditions In: CHRISTIANSON, A. & A. LUMSDEN, eds. *Contemporary Scottish Women Writers*. Edinburgh. pp. 11-26.

MORRISEY, J., 1994. *Materialist-Feminist Criticism and Selected Plays of Sarah Daniels, Liz Lochhead, and Clare Dowie*. [online]. PhD thesis ed. University of Sheffield. [viewed 29 April 2013]. Available from: <http://etheses.whiterose.ac.uk/1837/1/DX193507.pdf>

PATERSON, L., 1994. *The Autonomy of Modern Scotland*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

PAVIS, P., 1992. *Theatre at the Crossroads of Culture*. London : Routledge.

PAVIS, P., 1996. Introduction: Towards a Theory of Interculturalism in Theatre? In: PAVIS, P., ed. *The Intercultural Performance Reader*. London & NY: Routledge. pp.1-26.

PAVIS, P., 1989. Problems of Translations for The Stage: Interculturalism and Post-modern Theatre In: SCOLNICOV, H. & P. HOLLAND, eds. *The Play Out of Context*. Cambridge: The press syndicate at the University of Cambridge. pp. 25-44.

PEACOCK, N., 1993. *Molière in Scotland: 1945-1990*. Glasgow University.

PITTOCK, M.G.H., 2001. *Scottish Nationality*. Palgrave.

PODCAST., September 2012. Liz Lochhead on the 40th anniversary of Memo For Spring. *Scottish Poetry Library*. [Online]. [viewed 28 April 2013]. Available from: [http://scottishpoetrylibrary.podomatic.com/entry/2012-09-13T07\\_34\\_08-07\\_00](http://scottishpoetrylibrary.podomatic.com/entry/2012-09-13T07_34_08-07_00)

REIZBAUM, M., 1992. Canonical Double Cross In: LAWRENCE, K. R., ed. *Decolonizing Tradition: New Views of Twentieth Century British Literary Canons*. Urbana. pp. 165-190.

SCRIVEN, A. McM., 2004. The Muted Scot Woman and Margaret Oliphant's *Kirsteen* In: BELL, E. and G. MILLER, eds. *Scotland in Theory: Reflections on Culture and Literature*. Amsterdam : Rodopi. pp. 167-182.

VARTY, A., 1997. The Mirror and the Vamp: Liz Lochhead In: GIFFORD, D. and D. MCMILLAN, eds. *A History of Scottish Women's Writing*. Edinburgh. pp. 641-658.

WITTING, K., 1958. *The Scottish Tradition in Literature*. Edinburgh: Oliver and Boyd.

## Bibliography

CRICK, B., Jan-March 2008. The Four Nations: Interrelations. *The Political Quarterly*. Vol. 79, no.1. Blackwell Publishing. pp. 71-79.

GROSSBERG, L., 1996. Identity and Cultural Studies: Is That All There Is? In: HALL, S. & P. du GAY, eds. *Questions of Cultural Identity*. London: Sage. chapter 6.

HALL, S. & P. du GAY., 1996. *Questions of Cultural Identity*. London: Sage.

HEASLEY, R., 2005. Identifying Scotland and Wales: Types of Scottish and Welsh National Identities. *Nations and Nationalism*. vol 11, no. 2. ASEN. pp. 243- 263.

KEATING, M., 1997. Stateless Nation-Building: Quebec, Catalonia and Scotland in the Changing State System. *Nations and Nationalism*. Vol. 3, no. 4. ASEN. pp. 689 – 717.

KEATING, M., 2010. The Strange Death of Unionist Scotland. *Government and Opposition*. Vol.45, no.3. Blackwell Publishing. Pp. 365-385.

LAW, A, and MOONEY, G., 2012. 'Devolution in a 'Stateless Nation': Nation-Building and Social Policy in Scotland'. *Social Policy and Administration*. [online]. vol. 46, no 2. Open University Press. pp. 161–177. [viewed 10 February 2013].

NOTESTEIN, W., 1970. *The Scot in History*. Greenwood Press.

## **Chapter Two**

### **Nation, Myth and Identity in Scottish Theatre and Drama**

The chapter studies the dramatic narratives on the Scottish stage and the treatment of nation, myth and identity in them chronologically since the beginning of the twentieth-century and questions the civic form of nationalism introduced in the early 1990s. From the previous chapter it may be argued that the newly established anti-colonial form of nationalism benefitted both trends of national rhetoric. The nationalist supporters perceived it as a step towards independence and the unionist proponents interpreted it as a social change for preserving the Union. Both views converge into the so-called internationalist rhetoric for nation building and independence, which are expressed in cultural terms via the opposing views of multiculturalism and cultural hybridity.

Paterson argues that the two opposing views of national debate are contrived. Both treat the political sovereignty of Scotland as a completely negotiated state, i.e. they take the political claims of equality and liberty for granted. These could be traced in the reflection of cultural images and their interpretations of nation and myth in the Scottish theatre and drama since its creation. The analysis of the dramatic work on the Scottish stage after 1999 raises the question of whether the new national rhetoric has challenged the old cultural model.

The exploration of cultural identity in Scottish theatre in the early twentieth-century is dispersed with nostalgia and deeply plugged into history. This is often presented in various forms of romanticised and mythologized narratives, with the central role of Lallans (a synthetic literary form of Scots) in the literary and dramatic works of the Renaissance proponents after the 1920s and 1940s. The reasons for the strong connection with the past can also be sought in the formative forces of the collective idea of national identity and the maintained national pride in Scottish history, through shared cultural tropes and myths as a result of the introduced split in eighteenth-century Scotland discussed in Chapter One.

Those historical roots can also be interpreted as a product of the nationalist fiction heritage and nationalist political rhetoric which introduce cultural difference and cultural loss as a main nationalistic discourse of protest. Along with it, the main cultural myths of Tartanry, Kailyard and Clydeism are being revisited and demythologised for the purposes of redefining a modern national identity.

In the early 1970s Liz Lochhead's voice merges with two other significant poetic voices – those of Tom Leonard and Edwin Morgan, which place a special emphasis on the use of urban demotic language as part of the decolonisation of literature. In the case of the male poets, the primary concern is the de-anglicisation of Scots, whereas Lochhead's interest streams from the Liverpudlian concept about performative poetry.

The negative social and economic changes of the Thatcher regime are already foreshadowed by the 1978/79 winter of discontent among the working class in the urban Central Belt. They are further reflected in the 'hardman' voice as a dominant theatrical presence. The term originates from Tom MacGrath and Jimmy Boyle's play *The Hardman* (1977) which looks at the life of a Glasgow gangster and his subsequent imprisonment. John Byrne's *The Slab Boys* (1978) and *The Widows of Clyth* (1979) by Donald Campbell are also driven by the dynamic of working class Glaswegian. The built linguistic contrast has a specific reference for Lindsay Paterson:

But the linguistic contrast with English has not mainly been with England itself so much as with those Scottish social groups that can be claimed to have betrayed their country... The convention that the betrayal theme of Scotland can be symbolised in a linguistic betrayal and has become now utterly standard in Scottish drama... but an interesting shift has taken place, reflecting greater subtlety by means of a wider range of linguistic registers. (Paterson 1996, p. 77)

The strong presence of working class culture in Scotland in the 1960s and 1970s forms a new cultural image represented as an urban Scots-speaking working class male whose stability is shattered in the early years of Thatcherism. The economic

loss finds expressive voice in representations of the old theme of cultural betrayal further reinforced by the failed referendum for Scottish parliament in 1979.

Along with the demotic linguistic form narrating a specific and distinct masculine experiences, a characteristic of the period is the emergence and development of indigenous political theatre founded upon folkloric elements and popular culture. Undoubtedly, among the most important names of Scottish theatre at that time is 7:84 Scotland and its artistic director John McGrath who mixes political theatre with the popular musical hall culture and the folklore traditions of the ceilidh.

The third, most dominant trend of Scottish theatre in the period, is the genre of the history play. Postmodernist thinking challenges the concept of history and discredits its truthfulness by seeing it instead as a discourse constrained by language and narration. Such is the argument Ian Brown and Barbara Bell offer in their study of myth and history in contemporary Scottish drama (Brown & Bell 2000). The revisions of myths and history, in the Scottish context, thrive and produce an increased interest in writing historical plays, by both male and female playwrights. History becomes an expression of individual experience and opens space for constructing identity as an inclusive, rather than exclusive, model and of experiencing a multiplicity of identities, defined elegantly by McCrone:

What is on offer in the late twentieth century is what we might call 'pick'n mix' identity, in which we wear our identities lightly, and change them according to circumstances. (McCrone 1992, p. 170)

According to Brown, there are two general approaches to rewriting history: 'to deal with historical material with reference to its original context' and 'to explore historical material in the light of creating parallels' (2000, p. 37). A representative text is Ike Isakson's *An Gaisgeach – The Hero* (1995), which brings a fresh reading of the figure of Macbeth and the 'historic pressures on the Celtic culture' (Brown 2000, p. 37). A further exploration of linguistic mix with Gaelic is applied later by David Greig in his revision of the play in 2009. An example of the second trend is Aileen Ritchie's *The Juju Girl* (1999), in which the action unfolds in two parallel historical moments in Zimbabwe/ Rhodesia in 1999 and 1929, reflecting upon the



Scottish missionary action of colonisation and post-colonial Zimbabwe (Brown 2000, p. 38). The explored historical themes and figures are diverse: e.g. Hector Macmillan's *The Rising* (1973) is a story about a historical betrayal. *The Royal Visit* (1974) tells the story of the visit of King George IV and his host Walter Scott, Bill Bryden's *Willie Rough* (1972) looks into the story of trade unionist Billy and the destiny of shipbuilding in Glasgow under Thatcherism, while Ian Brown's *Carnegie* (1973) studies the myth of the benevolent millionaire philanthropist. Donald Campbell returns to religious interpretation in *The Jesuit* (1976) in order to tell the story of John Ogilvie, a seventeenth century Catholic priest, who was executed in 1615 for his refusal to acknowledge the Crown's spiritual authority. John McGrath and 7:84 Theatre plug into the past and contemporary history of the Highlands especially with *The Cheviot, the Stag, and the Black, Black Oil* (1973).

The dominant discourses of decolonisation (de-anglicisation promoting demotic Scots as a linguistic medium) and postmodernist revisionist mythmaking contribute to the development of Scottish theatre as a product of popular culture and populist dramatic tendencies. The awoken nationalistic aspirations in the 1980s, due to the occurring social and economic changes, bring the debate to a dead end. The reformed Scots on stage, which represents the voice of radical Scotland, gives birth to a new cultural mythology – Clydeism.

In the 1980s, the revised cultural image brings the Scottish consciousness back to the present. It is characterised as a modern, plural, inclusive and predominantly masculine due to the reformed Scots on stage socially mirroring the 1970s urban demotic masculine working class. The female identities in theatre are marginalised, mythologised and presented mainly in the domestic sphere of social life. This is still due to the dominant symbolic use of female images as a metaphor for natural physical Scotland and the Calvinist perception of women's sexuality in terms of power, among which of central importance is the historical figure of Mary Stuart.

As already discussed in the previous chapter, Mary Queen of Scots is a dichotomous trope of representation of the national identity interpreted with the language of

gender images and symbolism in Scotland by Reizbaum (1992, p. 185). This gendered image is often combined with the cultural type of the divided or domesticated self (Reizbaum 1992, p. 187). Reizbaum claims that in both cultures (Scottish and Irish) there is a desired exorcism which, in the Scottish case, is achieved through the anniversary of Mary's beheading instead of the usual narrative of heroic births. Mary is remembered both as the 'punished' national body and the one who gained martyrdom, which in Julia Kristeva's study of motherhood and the feminine takes the position of the 'Filter', or the phallic mother. The phallic mother consists of two main archetypes closely related to the mother image as a source of fear: the ecstatic and the melancholic. In the former, the mother is denied and her attributes are displaced onto the symbolic father leading to the submission of woman to a sexually undifferentiated androgynous being. The latter, however, experiences the submission to the father as punishment, pain and suffering, inflicted upon the heterogeneous body (Kristeva 1980, pp. 27-28).

Chapter One also discussed that a significant part of the Scottish theatre tradition in the 1980s was the adaptation of Molière's plays which contributed to the formation of Scottish national theatre at its best. 'MacMolière' is a term coined to describe the huge interest in the works of the seventeenth-century dramatist in Scotland in the 1980s. Lochhead actively contributed to this cultural movement, especially with her version of *Tartuffe* in 1985.

Lochhead and Peacock are unanimous about the Scottish appropriation of the French dramatist who has paradoxically encouraged the development of a sense of national theatrical identity. For Peacock, Molière is filling the gap of a Shakespeare-figure in Scottish theatrical history (1993, p. 233). Lochhead views Burns as the unrealised greatest Scottish dramatist and Molière as his replacement. In support to this argument, she draws a parallel between *Tartuffe* and Hollie Willie as archetypal brothers (*Educating Agnes* 2008, p. 7).

Hamish Glen, the director of one of MacMolière's productions (MacMillan's *Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme*) claims that the goal of those adaptations was to bring

about the de-anglicization of Scotland (Findlay 2000, p.152). In the programme note to the Royal Lyceum production of *The Hypochondriack* (1987), MacMillan suggests that all the various explanations about the popularity of the French dramatist, from the pantomime acting style, the auld alliance connections, or the lack of a national dramatist, could be valid. However, the one encompassing them all may involve national characteristics and resulting cultural influences (Findlay 2000, p. 153). Translating Molière into Scots is an easier option due to the cultural closeness (emotionally and intellectually). In particular, the common abrupt changes into the mood – from high tragedy to low comedy, or from high seriousness to grotesque comedy (the Caledonian Antisygyzy), which cannot be found very often in Anglo-Saxon writing (Findlay 2000, p. 153). MacMillan's opinion is further contested by the argument of Tom McGrath about the roots of national drama as anti-intellectual, popular theatre, hence such intellectual dualism between French and Scots is questionable. Moreover, Calder finds such affiliations incomprehensible:

The notion of closeness between French and Scottish culturally makes no sense. Scotland has strong affinities with the Breton, Basque and Occitanian cultures included in the French borders. By late seventeenth-century France was consciously modelled for Europe. (Calder 1997, p. 98)

Bill Findlay argues that the emerged nationalist sentiments in the same period were due to the political climate in the country. Such were the possibilities of a Scottish independent Parliament, the Independence Referendum in 1979, and the economic factor of the discovered oil in the North Sea, which the Scottish National Party (SNP) populist slogan claimed 'It's Scotland's Oil' (Findlay 2001, p. xii). All these lead to a national disappointment and further employment of the rhetoric of loss as the Referendum for Independence failed and the proceeds from Scottish oil industry remained under control of British government.

The 1980s national drama produced a kind of a theatre, according to Tom McGrath, which had more traits in common with the folklore tradition than any intellectual theatrical tradition (Findlay 2001, p. xxiii). It resulted from the previous decade of Scottish writing, which the artistic director of the Royal Lyceum Theatre, Clive Perry, saw as narrowed-minded. Perry lamented that the theatre of the 1970s focused too much on historical subjects and asserted that 'Scottish writers tended to see the

development of a national drama as primarily means for preserving the anachronistic form of Scots language' (Findlay 2001, p. xvi). Perry, McGrath and Stewart Conn considered all those narratives 'costume drama', and the language a 'sentimental cliché' (Findlay 2001, pp. xviii, xx).

Opponents to this view are writers such as Randall Stevenson and Alasdair Cameron, who consider the use of Lallans and other forms of Scots the most fundamental influence on the drama that empowered the progress of Scottish theatre and helped dramatists to explore the present.

Internationally, scholars continued to study Scots varieties with great fervour. Katja Lenz examined the use of obsolete Scots vocabulary in a corpus of twelve plays, some of which belong to the historical period under discussion. She discovered that the application of Scots belongs to a long Scottish literary tradition that started with the works of the fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Scottish Makars. It was then continued and revived by the most prominent Scottish writers such as eighteenth-century poets Allan Ramsay, Robert Fergusson, and Robert Burns, the nineteenth-century Romantic writer Walter Scott, and widely known and applied by the leading names of the twentieth-century Scottish Literary Renaissance (Lenz 2000, p. 1).

Women playwrights re-emerged in the same period. Among women writers who now gain prominence three names are regularly associated with resurrecting a female playwriting tradition in Scotland: Ena Lamont Stewart (*Starched Apron* (1945) and *Men should Weep* (1947)), A. J. Stewart (Ada F. Kay – real name, her most popular play is *The Men from Thermopylae* (1959)) and Joan Ure (*Something in It for Cordelia, Something in It for Ophelia, Take Back Your Rib, Then* (1971)) in the 1950-60s. However their work does not receive acknowledgement until the early 1980s due to the fame of popular working-class narratives like *The Sash* (1973) and *The Slab Boys* (1978) (Bain 1996, p. 139). Therefore, Scottish theatre in that period was a male dominated field in which women playwrights occupied a very small part. The three of them later took part in the formation of the Scottish Society of Playwrights in 1973.

The breakthrough of women dramatists in Scotland comes with the appearance of Sue Glover and her ambition to establish a school of women playwrights in the 1980s. Following Glover's success with her early plays *The Seal Wife* and *An Island in Largo*, the time was ripe for the appearance of the next generation of women writers including Liz Lochhead, Rona Munro, Catherine Lucy Czerkawska, Marcella Evaristi, Anne Downie and Sharman MacDonald, and later on Anne Marie di Mambro and Lara Jane Bunting. Audrey Bain describes the female agenda of the period as 'the unspoken histories of women thus leading to various discourses to undermine the historically established views of women and 'the eternal feminine' (Bain 1996, p. 139). Such are the main themes in *Blood and Ice* (1982) by Lochhead; *The Straw Chair* (1997) and *Bondagers* (1991) by Sue Glover; *The Maiden Stone* (1995), *Fugue* (1983) and *Piper's Cave* (1985) by Rona Munro. For Brown, Sue Glover, Rona Munro and Liz Lochhead are among the prominent women playwrights who explore the subjects of her-story and feminist myths by applying revisionist devices, distinct language forms, cyclic structure and 'dramaturgical form in which no single dramatic climax is achieved but there is a series of continuing points of denouement' (Brown & Bell 2000, p. 28).

Although the writings by women playwrights differ in approaches and applied techniques, for Brown their writings bear features that allow them to be grouped together as texts particularly created by women. In contrast to the current male playwrights, the female dramatists show a consistent interest in the individual experiences. These experiences are either related to historical events with attended 'texture and detail of life' away from the large-scale thematic or epic approach (Glover and Lochhead), or imagined past (Munro) (Brown & Bell, pp. 34-35). In those plays the cultural image is also split – women are cultural outsiders and socially marginalised because of their gender.

Adrienne Scullion defines the role of the emerging group of women playwrights as seeking 'to reassess and recreate the existing cultural codes and conventions and expose the emotional uncertainties beneath totemic structures' of the patriarchy and

phallogentric Scottish culture represented through the personification of women characters with natural, physical Scotland (Scullion 2000, p. 94). Such images are demythologised with the application of classic feminist techniques in which language plays a central role. According to Scullion, Glover and Munro often fuse myths and history in order to address key questions of identity and community (Scullion 2000, p. 103). Ksenija Horvat interprets such feminist revisions as stories about 'the personal struggle and experience of marginalised individuals' (Horvat 2005, p. 146). Scullion views Lochhead's writing as engaging with aspects of femininity often associated with the *unheimlich*<sup>x</sup> (Scullion 2000, p. 97). Similarly to Marcella Evaristi, Lochhead focuses on language and position of women writers (Evaristi changes her direction after *Commedia*, which treats the subject of the representation of the mother in twentieth-century Scotland and Italy). From the very beginning Lochhead declares that she is 'interested in stopping the silence not in describing female oppression' (Brown 1984). Therefore, she is not completely compliant with feminist artists, despite the use of feminist techniques and themes, especially for self-reflection and assertion as a female writer (Christianson 2000).

Lochhead is not the only one who bears 'The Canonical Double Cross' of being Scottish and female but what distinguishes her from the rest of the women Scottish playwrights is her positions of an insider, i.e. the applied re-signification of cultural and gender stereotypes is limited by the matrix of power. The position of women as cultural outsiders in feminist writing is often expressed through language, setting, landscape, or revision of history/myth. For instance, in *The Straw Chair* Rachel is the marginalised, bourgeois, female character, sent to exile by her family to a Gaelic island; Isabel is the pious, virgin, young minister's wife, and Oona is a local woman who has no common ground with the culture of the other two women, i.e. she is the cultural outsider while the other two characters are marginalised by the local culture. Ann Marie di Mambro's play *The Letterbox* (1989), originally written for and performed by 7:84 Theatre, is set on the doorstep of a flat. Martha, the mother, speaks to her daughter Wendy through a letterbox. Martha is a victim of domestic violence, additionally punished by one of the neighbours by calling her drunk. Munro's deep psychological drama *Iron* (2002) is set in a jail and treats one of the

playwright's most explored topics – the mother-daughter relationship. The daughter, Josie, pays visits to her mother, Fay, who had committed a terrible crime – she had murdered her husband. Munro manages to achieve an intricate and intense psychological narrative by applying the feminist interpretation of the Freudian concept of patricide, that of a matricide – the daughter has to kill (metaphorically and psychologically) the mother in order to become a complete woman and mother herself.

Among all the Scottish women playwrights, Ure seems to be the closest to the artistic zest of Lochhead. She is interested in gender and cultural myths and stereotypes and, like Lochhead, powerfully undermines them with the means of irony, meta-theatricality and other lyrical and dramatic feminist techniques. In two of her most popular poetic plays based on Shakespeare, Ure revisits *King Lear* and *Hamlet* through the eyes of the secondary female roles of Ophelia and Cordelia. In both plays, *Something in it for Cordelia* (1971) and *Something in it for Ophelia* (1971), the main characters are young, pragmatic, materialistic women, defined by Jan McDonald as 'women survivors... capable of debunking the myths that both society and dramatic literature have spun around femaleness' (McDonald 2002, p. 7).

In *Something in it for Cordelia*, Ure attacks the patriarchal cultural identity through the character of Cordelia and her father, who thinks of himself as a disabled person and whose throne has been replaced by a wheelchair. The play is set at Waverley Station, a cultural icon and also a border line in the historical writing of Scott. The short dramatic text is loaded with irony and the character of King Lear has been turned into a dysfunctional, powerless, old ex-celebrity, suffering with nostalgia about the past times. Ure remorselessly tackles Scottish myths: about tartanry, the Tattoo, the Highlands, the Scottish soldier, the English, the territory and myth of belonging, the relationship between father and daughter, the social roles of women constructed by the dominant phallogentric culture. Ure does not believe in the myth of English cultural imperialism, something Lochhead also touches upon, but in a more subtle way in her interpretation of the story of Mary Queen of Scots and the performed identities of the two queens. In Ure's understanding, the English myth is

used as an excuse by Scots to mask their cultural poverty (McDonald 2002, p. 1). Ure is interested in women's emancipation and she firmly believes that men and women are not biologically but socially and culturally determined. Therefore, she shows both men and women as victims of the mythologising of gender division in Scottish society which attributes factual narratives/realism to masculinity and fictional narratives/fantasy to femaleness. This gender division is also discussed by the playwright in the second short play *Something in It for Ophelia*, which complements, *Something in It for Cordelia*. *Something in It for Ophelia* is also set at Waverley Station. The play revolves around a conversation between two strangers waiting at the station – a young, materialistic woman Hannah and a more mature and romantic man, Martin, who hides behind Wittgenstein's *Tractatus*. Ure deliberately subverts the social and gender roles in the conversation and we gradually find that Hannah speaks with facts whereas Martin lives in his world of fiction, i.e. identification with the character of Hamlet. Such method of subversion is also used by Lochhead in order to depict strong female characters like Medea and Agnes in her adaptations in post-devolution Scottish society, a subject of discussion in Chapter Four and Chapter Five.

In the 1990s, the political shift towards devolution in Scotland introduces another dimension to the cultural identity question: post-colonialism. However, the focus of Scottish theatre, according to Scullion, remains engaged with national identity politics featuring dominantly male experiences. The continuous process of nation-building, as a dynamic debate between the national and the international, is represented metaphorically through the image of the borderline, or societies placed at margins. Old cultural models are being re-examined accordingly. For example, Colin Nicholson sees Lochhead's role in contemporary Scottish drama as the 'mask stripper', showing the hidden truth behind (Nicholson 2007, p. 64). Moreover, Paterson defines Morgan and Lochhead as the two poets and dramatists who deconstruct and transgress the established Scottish identity model of being 'mainly working class, mainly male or mainly about left-wing social realism.' (1996, p. 82).



The cultural divide is explored by Scottish male playwrights with the experiences of displaced male identities and 'egalitarian' community values threatened by the politics of individualism from outside. This is the period when the national identity previously represented in the form of Clydeism is shattered and replaced with the modern theme of internationalism, as a means of following an anti-colonial form of nationalism. The main features of anti-colonialism are decolonisation and nation building expressed in the artistic works of the writers in the period through studying major issues of community and male experiences of ambiguous state of belonging and displacement at the same time.

In Mike Cullen's *The Cut* (1993) 'Thatcherite individualism has penetrated the bastions of dignified labour; in David Greig's *Europe* (1994) those men who hark back to the old uncertainties also know that their position in the world is no longer tenable' (Pattie 2000, p. 9). The most displaced men are represented in the works of Chris Hannan, in particular, the characters of Sammy Doak in *The Evil Doers* (1990) and Charlie in *Shining Souls* (1996). (Pattie 2000, p. 10) They appear as socially marginalised characters whose life uncertainties speak of destabilisation of male identity. This destabilisation is a result of a long process of alienation from land (explored in Glover's *Bondagers* from a distinct female perspective) and jobs (brought about by Thatcherite economy and the rise of neoliberalism). The most recurrent images of cultural disalignment are representations of native characters as exiles and the borderline. Both are repeatedly represented through the setting, the language, or the conflict between strong images and characters, e.g. David Greig's *Europe* (1994), and Stephen Greenhorn's *Passing Place* (1998).

Greig's play *Europe* moves the setting outside Scotland into a small and rotten place in Eastern Europe (a completely imagined landscape but historically echoing the fall of communism as political system). Greig's characters are exiles and the experience of estrangement is achieved also with the two refugees, Katia and Sava, and their relationship with the local frustrated and dysfunctional community. Greig intentionally relates that imagined community to the Scottish cultural experience by making it local and European, or international, at the same time. A similar pattern,

Cairns Craig finds in the works of John Byrne, whose most famous plays are the trilogy *The Slab Boys* (2002, p. 1). Craig points out that Byrne's character displacements are represented through the experience of a double culture – Scottish and North American. The old iconic image of the Scottish immigrant is reversed – Scotland becomes a place whose local experiences are reshaped by a North American imagination. Furthermore, the traditional dissociation of regional, linguistic and religious differences is replaced with the immediate experiences of the local and the international.

The displaced, jobless Alex in *Passing Places* (1998) by Stephen Greenhorn, similarly to Billy in *Europe*, is forced to leave his home because he had lost his job. The play is a type of exploration of the mythical and modern history of Scottish cultural displaced identity experienced as the Other; unknown Scotland on the north through the eyes of foreigners who feel like at home. It is also a parody of established Scottish cultural stereotypes of the Highlands, travellers and women – almost a Scottish version of the Kerouac's *On the Road* (1957). In *Passing Places*, Alex experiences extreme displacement – he feels a foreigner. Greenhorn has reversed the experiences of the local and foreign inhabitants, thus achieving the effect of making the Scottish look international and the international – Scottish. Emanuela Rossini in *A Theatre That Matters* (2000) argues that the contemporary experience of Scottish culture is that of 'a sense of belonging and displacement' (p.145). Thus the sense of belonging in Greenhorn's play is reduced to the name 'Scottish', similarly to a name written on a map. The play also adds another theme, namely, that the land does not belong to the Scottish any more. This is a theme touched upon by Greig in *Europe* and more deeply discussed by David Harrower in *Dark Earth* (2003), in which a divide is drawn between the rural and urban and meets two families in order to show the political game behind the loss of lands, and, with it, the loss of historical roots.

Craig, an ardent supporter of Scottish nationalism and multiculturalism as an inclusive cultural model, interprets identity politics in Scotland after devolution from the perspective of the dominant discourse of hybridity. He argues that although

the racial or cultural hybridity have been frequently considered a constitutional weakness within Scottish identity judged from the point of view of Homi Bhabha, about multiculturalism and post-colonial studies, it is not the notion of national purity but dialogism which is the most important feature of Scottish identity (Craig 2004, p. 255). The critic elaborates this idea with the application of the Bakhtinian theory of polyphony, which in its essence is much more complex interpretation than the suggested form of dialogism and split cultural image.

Cultural hybridity is also seen as one of the most prominent features of Scottish theatre identity in the post-devolution Scotland by the Glaswegian theatre critic and scholar Adrienne Scullion. It is openly articulated through a number of metaphors of limited locations such as islands, small provincial towns, geographical and psychological borders, and even 'on the edge of the world' (Scullion 2007, p. 74)

A vital role in the development of theatre, for Scullion, is played by the new writing theatre in Edinburgh – the Traverse Theatre. The new generation of writers of the 1990s David Greig, Stephen Greenhorn, David Harrower, Nicola McCartney and Anthony Nielson inspired another wave of successful young playwrights like Henry Adam, Gregory Burke, Zinnie Harris, Douglas Maxwell, Iain MacLeod and Linda McLean. The 1990s playwrights were influenced by the previous generation of eclectic playwrights such as Peter Arnott, Jo Clifford, Simon Donald, Chris Hannan and Stuart Patterson whose participation in the 1985 'Points of Departure' season, offered unexpected eclecticism, robust politics and dramaturgical internationalism (Scullion 2007, p. 71).

Among them Arnott leaves a significant trace in the cultural identity debate. In *A Little Rain* (2000), Scotland is drowned in rain that has not stopped pouring for forty days and forty nights. He charts the territory of post-devolution Scotland as a daringly mythologised cityscape. Reflecting on the cultural responsibilities of home rule, beery newspaperman Michael (the plot is based on a series of encounters in a Glasgow pub) confides in failed student Phil that: 'we are ourselves again. And this

is who we are. Cunts... There are no excuses anymore. Officially, from now on, it's all our fault' (Arnott 2000, p. 43).

The same thematic contents for social and individual responsibility echo in a variety of plays – *The Speculator* (Greig 1999) and *When the Bulbul Stopped Singing* (Greig 2004); *Snuff* by Davey Anderson in 2005; Iain Heggie's *King of Scotland* (2000). Despite the innovation in Scottish drama and the works of female playwrights like Sue Glover (*Shetland Saga* 2000, etc.), Zinnie Harris (*Further than the Furthest Thing* 2000 and *Midwinter* 2004), Solstice McLean *Word for Word* (2003) and *Shimmer* (2004) and Rona Munro (*Iron* 2002, *The Last Witch* 2009, *Pandas* 2011), Scottish theatre remains largely dominated by male voices and representations of male experiences.

Contrary to the male playwrights, who focus on home and community issues, women playwrights after 1990s are preoccupied with representations of women outside the domestic space and deal with various social issues among who Lochhead is not an exception (Horvat 2005, p. 146). Lochhead's *Three Sisters* (2000) and *Medea* (2000) present images of women in the public space who narrate the existent social changes in the cultural space after Devolution and continue to show women as marginalised and cultural outsiders. Lochhead's adaptation of *The Misanthrope* sets Molière's darkest comedy in present time. *Miseryguts* (2002) continues the study of female identities in the Scottish context and problematises the cultural need of wearing social masks by women. It also treats the way female sexuality is perceived by the dominant masculine culture. Lochhead continues exploring the question of sexuality and its relation to culture through misreading gender difference as sex difference in *Educating Agnes* (2008). The visualised, oppressed colonised female body questions the relationship between the coloniser and the colonised in the Scottish context, as gender difference (referring to split power structure in the local culture) seems to be misinterpreted as an opposition between sexes.

This view is further reinforced by Horvat's description of Scottish female playwrights' invisibility in her article 'Scottish Women Playwrights Against Zero

Visibility' (2005). Although *nation* in the European context stopped existing as a homogenous reality after WW2, according to Kristeva in *Women's Time* (1980), it continued to exist only for ideological or political purposes, and reaffirmed social oppression. This is a result of the Western ideology of the nation-state as a symbolic construct and institutionalisation of gender difference. The view is also supported by Bob Doggett in *In the Shadow of the Glen: Gender, Nationalism, and a Woman Only*, who claims that with the exception of Franz Fanon, male theorists have felt unnecessary to explore the question of how nationalism and gender are related (Dogget, p. 1011). In his study of John Synge's play *In the Shadow of the Glen* (1903/04) in the context of gender and Irish nationalism, Doggett argues that any linkage of the feminist and nationalist interpretations produced by critics so far 'would seem naively superficial' (Dogget, p. 1011). However, the nationalist view is often dismissive and patronising, whereas the feminist readings critique patriarchy, which re-inscribes the social values which have historically excluded women and ethnic or racial minorities by imposing images of 'homogenous patriarchy and proper female behaviour' (Dogget, p. 1012).

Stephanie Lehner in *The Subaltern in Devolution and Post-colonial Scotland* argues that post-colonial criticism within a Scottish context inevitably prioritised issues of nationhood and nationalism over other important issues of individual and common identification (2012, p.7). One of the common criticisms of the anti-colonial nationalism is that, being a collective identity, it may often transfer the same limitations of the colonial state. The most frequent criticisms come from feminists, who, while not being excluded from the liberation movements, often find that post-colonial texts 'fail to consider gender issues adequately' by focusing through the issues such as decolonisation and nation-building (2012, p. 7). On the other hand, post-colonialism criticises mainstream feminism (Western), which fails to include 'issues of race, the stereotyping or overgeneralization of the Third World Woman' (Lazarus and Young, p. 198). Such is the use of the exotic Other by Lochhead in her dramatic adaptations after 2000 (*Medea, Educating Agnes*), which leads to the idea that she re-establishes the westernised, white patriarchal colonial view in order to reflect, criticise and ironise the attempt for national reformation in Scotland. For

example, *Medea* is a dark comedy commenting on the dominant nationalist rhetoric of multiculturalism and decolonisation of the contemporary Scottish society. On the contrary, *Miseryguts* is a critical mirror of the contemporary cultural image of media and politicians in Edinburgh, with the idea of self-colonisation in the face of Alex as self-deluded and hypocritical, and the question of internal colonisation with the character of Celia. At the heart of the play, despite the strong characterisation of Alex (Alceste), the Scottish *misanthrope*, lies the question about institutionalised misogyny towards successful women in their professional careers. The cultural journalists Celia Mann and Zoe Arnott are social enemies who share opposite views about feminism and women's emancipation. Alex's misanthropy consists of a constant state of opposition, snobbishness and romanticised views about women and love, which is shared to an extent by the protagonist of David Greig's recent play *The Strange Undoing of Prudencia Hart* (2011). Set in the Borders on a winter day, stuck in a pub after her conference misfortunes, Prudencia, a reference to the old middle class sexual prudence, is introduced as a character suffering from Electra complex with a passion for ballad collecting – an influence from her father:

Prudencia Hart – then – was a prudent  
Twenty-eight-year-old postgraduate student  
Her PhD was on the topography of Hell

...

And very much thinking that 'She was above the common herd...' (Greig 2011, p. 6)

Lochhead reveals such middle class prudence and hypocrisy in the character of Zoe, a supporter of nationalist feminist views, who is often perceived by men as cold, frigid and tastelessly clothed. Celia, her enemy and opponent, supports different views of women's emancipation and performs as sexually free woman, interpreted as 'the slut' by the patriarchal culture. Celia has climbed to the position of cultural journalist and stays on the borderline between the average conformist woman, or man, in the local society – one of the main reasons to love Alex who rejects her. Celia's beliefs bring her closer to the way working class is perceived by the traditional, middle class member Pru:

Working-class performativity  
Isn't plain song or ballad, it's all celebrity. (Greig 2011, p. 9)

Lochhead, similarly to Greig, deconstructs the dominant feminist views with the introduction of a second woman as character construction technique. In such way, she often defines the middle class members, similarly to Greig's Pru character, as social exiles. The deconstruction of stereotyped female images argues for individualised female identity. However, if in Greig the traditional middle class snobbishness has turned them into culturally marginalised society members, in Lochhead those characters are cultural exiles, turned by dominant politics (masculine, nationalist) into an act of cultural abjection.

Equally unacceptable, for Lochhead, are the internationalist views of the second group of nationalist proponents like Greig and Scullion, who envisage Scottish cultural identity after devolution as a hybrid. Scullion talks about cultural hybridism and argues that the national identity and the representation of nation remain key themes across the whole of Scottish culture (Scullion 2002, p. 374). Based on her previous publication, Scullion reaffirms that the narratives have been primarily masculine and shares McCrone's view that Scottish culture is phallogentric:

... the depiction of women has been particularly vulnerable - being relegated 'to walk-on parts', to roles as 'keepers of the moral and family values of the nation' – for example, Chris Guthrie in *Sunset Song* (1932), Peggy in *The Gorbals Story* (Glasgow Unity, 1946), or even Janet in *Dr Finlay's Casebook*. (Scullion 2002, p. 375)

The theme is expanded with the metaphor for colonial exploitation of women, vividly explored and contested by Harrower in *Knives in Hens* (1995) and Lochhead in *Educating Agnes* (2008). Scullion revisits her own concerns about contemporary Scottish drama being preoccupied with the 'parameters of gender and national identity' in terms of inclusion/exclusion of community by suggesting 'a less rigid and more flexible' redefinition of community after Devolution (2002, p. 376). Scullion selects three plays by women playwrights: *Further Than the Furthest Thing* by Zinnie Harris, *Shetland Saga* by Sue Glover and *Home* (part of the NTS launch programme in Glasgow) by Nicola McCartney produced in 2000 in order to elicit it.

*Further than the Furthest Things* exploits issues of language and otherness from the perspective of post-colonisation (the return of the native theme) in which the island

symbolises the colonised past. The positive tone of Harris, in the opinion of Scullion, runs through the play with the idea of alternative belongings, which is shared by the other two plays selected by the critic (Scullion 2001, p. 381). Another common feature, more prominently expressed in Glover's play, is Scottishness as hybrid. The initial use of language by Glover is to assert difference but gradually the group of Bulgarian sailors become integrated into the local community. This narrates a dismissal of the old 'not English' as a way of identifying '*differences* from Scotland' and a move towards self-identification as a process of '*differences within*' (Scullion 2001, p. 384) via the image of the 'returned exile'. McCartney's play deals with one of the key identities in Scottish drama, i.e. of the family. She depicts a female community in an intricate, non-naturalistic narrative about two middle aged sisters and the daughter (in her twenties) of one of the sisters who enter a complex two day conversation of memories and arguments. The play again revisits 'the return of the native' theme and brings a complex interpretation by having one of the young sisters suffer from Asperger's syndrome. The key family identity is central to Lochhead's plays too as a form of political debate, e.g. *Thebans* (2003), based on the classical tragedians Sophocles and Euripides (*The Theban Plays* and *Phoenician Women*), does portray a dysfunctional royal family as a subtle ridicule at the contemporary British society. However, the concept of hybridity may lack validity, as Lochhead seems to argue against it in the same play and in her adaptation of Chekhov's *Three Sisters* in 2000. The latter play focuses on the irony and conflict between the English middle class sisters stuck in a patriarchal small town and the local working class Nettie. The latter gradually takes power over the sisters' house while the sisters passively dream of going back – as a commentary on the theme of the 'returned native/exile' and the old nationalistic rhetoric of cultural loss.

Trish Reid approaches the question of representation of national identity in post-devolutionary Scottish theatre and remarks how easily critics like Craig and Scullion slip into taking the cultural hybridity of the new Scottish identity for granted. An observation that strikes Paterson too, who claims that academics in Scotland in general take Scottish national identity for granted, the same way the fighting political class formations of unionists and nationalists treat the subject prior to 1990s.



To support her argument, Reid looks at the works of Henry Adam and Douglas Maxwell. In *Among Unbroken Hearts* (2000), Adam problematises the clash of cultures within traditional Scotland. His next play *The People Next Door* (2003) is an ironic examination of paranoia terrorism after 9/11 and supports Paterson and Craig's model of inclusive Scottish citizenship. However, *Petrol Jesus Nightmare no 5* (2006) undermines the assumed devolutionary emancipation, suggesting that 'any notional freedom is complicated and compromised by over-riding global concerns' (Reid 2011). *e Polish Quine* (2007) introduces the alienated, damaged hero, who despondently needs to reconnect with his childhood landscape and culture in Caithness and examines the themes of migration, trauma and xenophobia (Reid 2011). The latest work of Douglas Maxwell revisits the old discourse of the image of the Scot abroad. The main character in *Promises, Promises* (2010), Miss Margaret Ann Brodie, is a Scottish spinster living in London. Maxwell's play problematises the notion of Scotland and the Scottish as a cosmopolitan post-nation at ease with its contested past and able (due to its inherent heterogeneity) to accommodate unlimited cultural perspectives (Reid 2011). Reid concludes:

if we are to take seriously the notion of post-devolution Scotland developing 'a new non-threatening nationalism', one that can accommodate both the nation's internal plurality and its ambition towards international engagement, we must carefully consider how these positive ambitions are culturally animated and not simply take them for granted. (2011, p. 199)

Lochhead also supports the view that the new model of post-colonial nationalism is problematic and both trends have underplayed the interpretation of the national question. Further to it, Lochhead is not only non-nationalist, viz. Chapter One, but with her post-devolutionary adaptations she clearly takes a non-feminist position despite the continuous interest in women and Scottish culture. Further light on the question how Lochhead and the rest of the Scottish playwrights reflect upon the contemporary national model is shed with the next chapter which studies the emergence of adaptations after Devolution and the reading of cultural identities inserted within the theoretical framework of Pavis.

To sum up, the cultural paradox in Scotland mentioned by Paterson in Chapter One is reflected in the interpretations of nation, myth and identity in the Scottish theatre in the pre-Devolution period. The model is split, masculine and laden with cultural myths.

The first steps of indigenous Scottish theatre bring the cultural consciousness to the past due to the employment of literary Scots as a means of introducing political debate and follow the ethnic nationalistic project of the Scottish Renaissance leaders. Kemp, Carin and MacMillan are just few of the Scottish playwrights who put the foundations of the local Scottish theatre with the adaptation of the social satire of Molière for the Scottish stage and actors. Apart from their pioneering role, they also contribute to the ‘plugging into history’ of the Scottish, as Brown describes the image of Scottish theatre in the 1970s, and Perry and McGrath criticise it for its parochialism and use of ‘costume Scots’ reflecting into mostly nostalgic cultural images.

The revision of stage Scots and the accompanying cultural mythology is instigated with the awoken nationalistic sentiments in the 1970s due to the discovery of oil in the North Sea, as Findlay argues, and the failed Referendum for Scottish Independence in 1979. Those sentiments are further fed by the sobering governmental policy of Margaret Thatcher and the Conservative Party in Scotland, echoed in the concepts of Clydeism, betrayal and strong masculine identity that now rise amongst the working classes of the Central Belt.

The role of poets like Morgan, Leonard and Lochhead does not only reform stage Scots with demotic richness but also shifts the cultural consciousness away from the past deep into the present. The following postmodernist revision of culture, myths and history, both by male and female playwrights, reveals a lack of a single cultural image, which Corbett (1999) interprets as a voice of Scottish multiculturalism inclusive in its core. Ironically, female identities are frequently excluded from it and generally represented as cultural outsiders by women playwrights like Glover, Munro, etc. Reizbaum sees it as a gendered question of national identity debate,

which in the case of Scotland is often represented by the dichotomous image of Mary Stuart, a female trope usually accompanied by internally divided cultural and domesticated selves.

In the 1990s, the cultural image is still divided but reveals a society that is now transitioning from community based values to individualism. This is also reflected in the works of playwrights after 2000, calling for individual responsibility for national growth identity in post-devolution Scotland. Those cultural images, according to Scullion, follow the framework of post-colonial discourses of cultural hybridity and remain focused on the debate of national identity, featuring mainly male experiences. They reveal a dynamic relationship between the national and international and very often are set on the margins, both physically and/or psychologically. Further, in the revised view of Scullion, the difference from outside is replaced with a study of the difference within for the male cultural identity model. However, according to Horvat (2005) the female identities still remain invisible in the cultural image.

Lehrner studies the problem with anti-colonial nationalist theory and claims that such national discourses very often present collective identity with stronger focus on de-colonisation and nation-building rather than on gender or any other minority groups in the society. Lochhead's adaptations after 2000, along with the works of Morgan, problematise the cultural question with the representation of the feminine and question power with a study of sexuality in the contemporary cultural context. They contribute to Reid's criticism of Scullion and Craig who accept, without questioning, that Scottish cultural hybridity is an open model by depicting a society that still faces troubles with sexuality and women.

Despite of the rebuilt and renewed community after Devolution, and even during the years of the creation of the welfare state (1910 – 1950s and beyond), Scottish theatre remains preoccupied with the question of national identity as a phallogentric model. The new internationalist model of anti-colonial nationalism, treated by both trend supporters, playwrights and scholars equally as post-colonial, has concealed the same old question of anti-Englishness as a main marker of identity formation (the abjected

image). This is because, as Lochhead's adaptations ironically state, the term post-colonialism cannot be replaced with the term post-British in Scotland with the same ease with which it could be applied for the post-colonial condition in the countries from the Commonwealth, e.g. India.

References:

BAIN, A., 1996. 'Loose Canons: Identifying a Women's Tradition in Playwriting' In: STEVENSON, R. and G. WALLACE, eds. *Scottish Theatre Since the Seventies*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. pp. 138 -145.

BROWN, I., 1984. Interview with Liz Lochhead. *Interface*. (3).

BROWN, I. & B. BELL, 2000. A Duty to History: Contemporary Approaches to History and Cultural Identities in Scottish Theatre In: POGGI, V. and M. ROSE, eds. *A Theatre That Matters*. Milano : Unicopli. pp. 19-40.

CHRISTIANSON, A., 2000. Liz Lochhead's Poetry and Drama: Forging Ironies In: Christianson, A. & A. LUMSDEN, eds. *Contemporary Scottish Women Writers*. Edinburgh. pp. 41-52.

CRAIG, C., June 2002. 'Displacements – The Theatrical Art of John Byrne'. *IJoST*. [online] Vol.3, no. 1. Edinburgh: Queen Margaret University. [viewed 6 March 2009]. Available from: <http://journals.qmu.ac.uk/index.php/IJoST/article/view/88/html>

CRAIG, C., 2004. Beyond Reason – Hume, Seuth, McMurray and Scotland's Postmodernity In: BELL, E. and G. MILL, eds. *Scotland in Theory: Reflections on Culture and Literature*. Amsterdam, NY: Rodopi. pp. 249-284.

DOGGET, B., Winter 2000. 'In The Shadow of the Glen': Gender, Nationalism and 'a Woman only In: *ELH*, [online]. vol.67, no 4. The John Hopkins University Press. Pp.1011-1012. [viewed 24 September 2009].

FINDLAY, B., 2000. *Motivation and Method in Scots Translations, Versions and Adaptations of Plays from the Historic Repertoire of Continental European Drama*. PhD thesis ed. Queen Margaret University.

FINDLAY, B., 2001. *Scots Plays of the Seventies*. Glasgow: Bell and Bain Ltd.

FOLORUNSO, B., 1999. *No Place to Hide: Contemporary Scottish Theatre and Post-coloniality*. PhD thesis ed. University of Edinburgh.

GREIG, D., 2011. *The Strange Undoing of Prudencia Hart*. London: Faber and Faber Ltd.

HORVAT, K., 2005. Scottish Women Playwrights Against Zero Visibility. *Etudes Ecosaisies*. [online] Issue 10, p 146. [viewed 14 March 2009] Available from: <http://etudesecosaisies.revues.org/index157.html>.

KRISTEVA, J., 1977. *About Chinese Women*. Transl. A. BARROWS. London: Marion Boyars.

LAZARUS, N. & R. YOUNG. Post-colonialism in *Post-colonial studies* 46.

LEHNER, S., 2012. *Subaltern Ethics in Contemporary Scottish and Irish Literature: Tracing Counter-Histories* Palgrave Macmillan.

LENZ, K., June 2000. The Use of Obsolete Scots Vocabulary in Modern Scottish Plays. *IJoST*. [online]. vol.1, no.1. Edinburgh: Queen Margaret University. [viewed 26 February 2010] Available from: [http://www.arts.gla.ac.uk/scotlit/asls/ijost/Volume1\\_no1/K\\_Lenz.htm](http://www.arts.gla.ac.uk/scotlit/asls/ijost/Volume1_no1/K_Lenz.htm).

LOCHHEAD, L., 2008. *Educating Agnes*. London: NH Books Ltd.

MCCRONE, D., 1992; 2001. *Understanding Scotland: the Sociology of a Stateless Nation*. London: Routledge.

MCDONALD, J., 2002. Is It not Possible to Have a Poem Made out of Theatre? – an Assessment of the Drama and Dramaturgy of Joan Ure. *IJoST*. [online]. Vol.3, no. 1. Edinburgh: Queen Margaret University. pp. 1-7. [viewed 1 June 2012] Available from: [http://www.arts.gla.ac.uk/scotlit/asls/ijost/Volume3\\_no1/1\\_mcdonald\\_j.htm](http://www.arts.gla.ac.uk/scotlit/asls/ijost/Volume3_no1/1_mcdonald_j.htm) .

NICHOLSON, C., 2007. Towards a Scottish Theatrocracy: Edwin Morgan and Liz Lochhead In: SCHOWNW, B., ed. *The Edinburgh Companion to Scottish Literature*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. pp. 159-166.

PATERSON, L., 1996. Language and Identity on the Stage In: STEVENSON, R. and, G. WALLACE, eds. *Scottish Theatre Since the Seventies*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. pp. 75 - 83.

PATTIE, D., December 2000., The Decentring of Docherty: the Scotsman in Contemporary Drama. *IJoST*. [online]. vol. no.2. Edinburgh: Queen Margaret University. [viewed 8 September 2010]. Available from: [http://www.arts.gla.ac.uk/ScotLit/ASLS/ijost/Volume1\\_no2/D\\_Pattie.htm](http://www.arts.gla.ac.uk/ScotLit/ASLS/ijost/Volume1_no2/D_Pattie.htm)

PEACOCK, N., 1993. *Molière in Scotland: 1945- 1990*. Castle Cary Press. Somerset.

REID, T., 2011. Post-Devolutionary Drama In: BROWN, I., ed. *The Edinburgh Companion to Scottish Drama*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. pp. 188-199.

REIZBAUM, M., 2005. Gender and Nationalism in Scotland and Ireland: Making and Breaking the Waves In: MCLLAVENNEY, L. And R. RAY, eds. *Ireland and Scotland: Culture and Society, 1700-2000*. Dublin; Portland, OR : Four Courts Press. pp. 183-202.

ROSSINI, E., 2000. National Identity in Contemporary Scottish Theatre and the Challenge for the Italian Translator In: POGGI, V. and M. ROSE, eds. *A Theatre That Matters*. Milano: Unicopli. pp. 145-156.

SCULLION, A., 2000. Contemporary Scottish Women Playwrights In ASTON, E. and J. REINELT, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to Modern British Women Playwrights*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 94-118.

SCULLION, A., 2002. Self and Nation: Issues of Identity in modern Scottish Drama by Women In: Barker, C. & S. TRUSSLER., eds. *New Theatre Quarterly*. Issue 68, vol. 17, part 4. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 374-376.

SCULLION, A., 2007. Devolution and Drama: Imagining the Possible In: SCHOENE, B., ed. *The Edinburgh Companion to Contemporary Scottish Literature*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. pp. 68 -77.

## Chapter Three

### **Adaptations of the Classics for the Scottish Stage and the Voices of Lochhead**

As discussed in the previous chapter, Scottish theatre and translation studies critics such as Corbett and Scullion identify the question of national identity with the distinct trait of cultural hybridity central to the theatre in Scotland after Devolution. Lochhead views the new model of nationalism as the old model of identity, achieved through a formal transgression of old nationalist mythology of cultural imperialism and cultural assimilation. The analysis of adaptations of the classics by Scottish playwrights seeks to reveal this. The chapter also argues that the applied adaptation approach by Lochhead resembles the process of movement to the new nationalism by introducing a formal performative transgression of gender and culture stereotypes. In this sense, the adaptations of classical texts in the period under discussion hold motifs that have gone beyond Aaltonen's model of productive reception (theatre tradition making) and approached Pavis' view about self-reflectivity.

Scullion's argument that post-colonial study of national identity in Scottish theatre shifted to differentiating cultural images while searching for foreign/international (but not necessarily anti-English) sentiments corresponds to Pavis' interpretation of the question of adaptations of the classical playtexts with the central idea of cultural self-reflexivity, where the images of the foreign facilitates the recognition of the similarities of the cultural self with the image of the Other as already elicited in Chapter One.

The radical supporters of the national debate in Scotland retain the importance and centrality of the question of language in a similar fashion to the scholarship of adaptation studies. Chronologically, Scots is not only a complex term that corresponds to a variety of registers, but has been idiosyncratically applied by adaptors. For example, Robert Kemp applied Lallans in *Let Wives Tak* (1948), but not exclusively, in order to transpose the eighteenth-century French world of the play to eighteenth-century Scotland. Alternatively, Tom Leonard introduced Glaswegian



Scots in the adaptation<sup>xi</sup> of *Mother Courage* (2010), due to the cultural and linguistic proximity and in order to conjure a unique Scottish experience of the classic. Leonard's leading character in the play is exclusively self-reflective and self-referential. The anti-hero is the language itself: 'Mother Courage is the only Scottish speaker and the diction is an index of class.' (Leonard 2010). The motives of both playwrights differ although they both share the desire to express cultural identity. If for Kemp the main purpose is to preserve the Scottish idiom and develop an indigenous theatre tradition, for Leonard it is a means of social reflection on class, language and nation.

Lochhead also employs the self-reflexive function of Scots with the idea of commenting on class issues within the national model and established culture and gender stereotypes. However, the linguistic form of Lochhead's Scots follows the second trend in theatre, which Lenz often calls 'ideal', or stage Scots. This new linguistic form only resembles the melody of its original and sometimes introduces an element of alienation and foreignness according to the political commentary of the adaptor. Scullion observes that Lochhead often applies her own form of Scots in order to study aspects of femininity often associated with the *unheimlich*<sup>xii</sup>, which then brings out the Monster image as the poetic and dramatic voices of the playwright suggested in Chapter One.

These two major trends of approaching and using Scots registers in adaptation support the depicted trends of national identity discourses in Scotland before Devolution, mentioned previously. The *literary/textual* trend deals with political nationalism and the linguistic medium of Scots takes central place in its discourse. Its supporters work within the modernist Renaissance project of Hugh MacDiarmid and develop Scots from synthetic to a diverse number of colloquial forms and attempt to apply demotic Scots as classical language. They also retain the left political orientation of the project and work towards establishing Scotland within the European historical and literary and theatrical contexts. The second trend, which I broadly call '*internationalist*', deals with all the rest of the adaptations of classics which encompass nationalistic views combined with feminist (e.g. Lochhead) or

‘intercultural’ views (e.g. Greig). They do not exclude the use of Scots but mainly as a dramatic device rather than as a part of the already established nationalist discourse in the country.

The proponents of the literary trend consider the question of the status of Scots and its linguistic potential central to the national identity debate. It is also the most scholarly explored area in terms of adaptations of plays for the Scottish stage. John Corbett’s book *Written in the Language of the Scottish Nation* (1999) looks into the history of literary translations for a period of five hundred years and Bill Findlay’s *Frae Ither Tongue* (2004) studies the contemporary translations into Scots in literature and theatre. The language idiom they discuss is lowland Scots (Central Belt).

Despite the intelligibility of Glaswegian Scots, Findlay argues that it is not problematically applied to popular, folkloric texts, and texts in dialects or comedies. However, it does posit some serious challenges to translation in the tragic form. In an interview with the director Mike Duffy from Edinburgh Theatre Arts and their recent production of *MacBeth* in Scots, I asked if he was not afraid that the audience would perceive it with the idea of a lowered or comic theatre. He assured me that Robin Lorimer is the son of the translator of the New Testament in Scots (General Scots) and his idiom is as poetic and tragic as Shakespeare’s original (Duffy & Dixon 2012). Lorimer was the editor of his father’s translation work, hence, for the director, Lorimer’s language should have been strongly influenced by the richness of the translation. In Duffy’s view, the perception in British theatre establishment and amongst Scottish audiences of Glaswegian Scots as a comic linguistic medium comes from the work of Harry Lauder and music hall theatres. The genre had a very strong tradition in Glasgow and mixed Scots words with colloquialisms and slang were used for the purposes of light entertainment and to export it outside Scotland’s borders. Morgan’s adaptation of Racine’s *Phedre*, however, applied urban demotic Scots forms that led to serious challenges and harsh criticism by the audience and reviewers.

Lochhead, contrary to Morgan, never aimed at leaving the comic form in her plays. Even in the most tragic plays *Thebans* (2003), she introduces the Guard as the only Scots speaker, and also a music hall comedian, who delivers a message loaded with humour to Kreon. Lochhead does not accidentally placed it there because, as an artist interested in *voice*, she finds it in the space of the comic and irony:

I think my principal love is language itself. When I can't write it's because I can't find the right language. It's not the ideas. Any ideas I've got come already clothed in language ... If something doesn't have irony in it for me it wouldn't be alive. The kind of amazement I have is often in simple language, how much of a giveaway it is. (McMillan 1993, p. 21)

She is also not very experimental dramaturgically as the theatrical form she applies for all of her adaptations, both comedies and tragedies, belongs to Kemp's theatrical tradition of the British pantomime structure. The question is further explored in the rest of the thesis.

Lochhead finds irony in the manipulation of narrative registers, clichés, colloquialisms, idiomatic expressions, any act of storytelling from folklore (e.g. ballads), popular tales and stereotypes to the classics which have reached the status of popular narratives in the playwright's perception and interpretation.

The sense of dark humour is a feature of Scottish sensibility that is rooted in the balladic tradition and is also turned into a main source of inspiration by Lochhead. Such a cultural link has been also exploited by Mike Duffy in his 2012 production of *Macbeth* in Scots. The Edinburgh Theatre Arts group is a community theatre that has existed in Scotland since 1948. Their production of the Scottish play in the translation by Lorimer places the witches (weirds in translation) as the main driving force of the story and turns them almost into a Greek Chorus. Along with their stronger presence on the stage, there is a new character introduced – that of the blind seer, who could be traced back to the figure of Hecate in the original, although the comparison is not complete. The seer (performed by Lorna, Mike's wife and artistic collaborator) is in slight charge of the witches and speaks only three times in a non-human voice. The motivation for the introduction of the seer character was mainly dramaturgical – to master the apparition scenes. With regards to Hecate, described in

very dark and horrible language by Shakespeare, Lorimer transfers her image to the hilarious, dark comic presence of Queen Elphame, a balladic character from the Border ballads, who belongs to Elfland, similar to the queen of the underworld. Greig further exploits the same cultural link in order to socially criticise the conservativeness of the Scottish and their romanticised cultural views in *The Strange Undoing of Prudencia Hart* (2011), a metanarrative about the tragic story of Prudencia, by applying the balladic form in theatre.

Despite the formal classification of Lochhead as belonging to the second trend of adaptation, in fact, due to her idiosyncratic approach and subject of study, such a classification is very broad; her work belongs to both trends against the acceptance of certain conditions. In the opinion of Brown, *Antigone*, first written and produced in 1969 by the Strathclyde University Drama Society (later reformed into Strathclyde Theatre Group) and reworked in 1996, is a successful reflection of culture (Brown 2000). The prerequisites for such questioning are in the community's understanding of debate and egalitarianism which, for the same author, is reflected in the Kirk republican structure where no hierarchy could be observed. The transposition of the Greek myth of *Antigone* into Scots was interpreted as successful due to the theme of the tragedy which treated issues of familial ties and their impact on hierarchical duty. In Scotland in particular, due to its historical experience, the theme of conflict of familial and social duty is central (Brown 2000, p. 3). Paterson (1994) explains it with the specific social and political formation of the Scottish community in nineteenth-century, which led to the high politicisation of the personal/familial relationship in twentieth century. The expression of the conflict is dynamic and contains a frequent change of registers in order to mark cultural and political points and is also a reflection of the move between the public and the private (Brown 2000, p. 5). This ability of Scots to embody direct debate and familial and political discussion facilitated the adaptation's rendition and reception in its fullest meaning of performance text (Brown 2000, p. 6). In this framework, for Brown, Scots is a powerful metalanguage in theatre, which characterizes with 'democratic intellect and constant questioning of hierarchy' (2000, p. 1).

Lochhead also employed the meta-linguistic traits of Scots in her works, such as *Tartuffe* (1985) and *MQS* (1987). Both re-worked texts, however, dispute the democratic intellect and question the power of Scots. It is a means for the playwright to reveal the social hypocrisy of the ruling classes, their socially constructed images, and the fearful experience of female sexuality. In *MQS*, Mary and Elizabeth each switch roles (and languages) to become the other's maid which speaks of a performative function of the language similarly to the concept of identity also observed by Randall Stevenson in Lochhead's first adaptation of Molière in 1985, *Tartuffe*:

– such marked incorporations of an extrinsic register, or lapses into one – add to the translation's sense of language as performance, as play and pretence for characters themselves. ... Lochhead creates characters who often exploit different registers in order, literally, to distinguish themselves: to aspire or cling to the social levels such speech forms suggest. (Stevenson 2004, p. 120)

In the same play Lochhead gives all characters, with the exception of Dorine, a double linguistic identity in order to present a special Scottish reading of the theme of hypocrisy.

And contrary to Brown, who believes that a direct personal experience and intensity of dramatic expression can only be achieved with the application of Scots, Lochhead problematises the ability of the linguistic medium to discuss the political subject of Greek tragedy as a debate between the private and the public. In her adaptations *Medea* (2000) and *Thebans* (2002), she challenges the democratic intellectual traits of the Scottish society and questions the ability of tragedy adaptation to study the national question as a debate between the private and the public. On the one hand, the socially and politically reformed Scottish community after the 1950s (the welfare state) has increased the political role of individualism. Lochhead portrays it as problematic by metaphorically fusing the two spheres of the private and the public into a grotesque political figure of a mutually performing coloniser and colonised. On the other hand, such an interpretation of the increased political role of the private presents the debate for 'national hybridity' questionable, and, in this sense, the concept of the 'returned native' in post-devolution drama used as a means for self-mockery.

Bill Dunlop, in *Klytemnestra Bairns* (1991-1993), supports the opinion that the very act of writing into Scots is immediately interpreted as political. Dunlop considers the strength of Scots in its variety and ability to render emotions with remarkable precision although being restricted in 'its abilities to discuss intellectual concepts', which links Dunlop's position to the inferiorist's perceptions of the language such as those of Findlay (Dunlop 2002, p. 2). Dunlop utilises another feature of the language medium, namely, its ability to express irony, sarcasm and the ridiculous (Dunlop 2002, p. 3). Lochhead supports the latter view with her interest in language as the source of irony (and direct emotional impact) rather than a pool of ideas and academic research. Her position as a writer was discussed in Chapter One – as a successor of the Liverpulian poets she is interested in reflecting upon contemporary issues and performing them, both literary and metaphorically, expressed with the assistance of language politically spoken as anti-intellectual.

Due to the dramatic and psychological richness of the playtext, Dunlop aimed at producing a generally comprehensible version, which forced him to avoid any archaisms or vocabulary that will puzzle the modern audience. As a result, the adaptation had a comparatively limited vocabulary (Dunlop 2002, p. 3). However, for the rendering of the psychological richness, Dunlop relied on the modern psychological theory of Melanie Klein which saw infant behaviour as cyclical in its relation to the mother (Dunlop 2002, p. 2). In his article, Dunlop reveals that what he meant to indicate was that 'not only are there several variants of Scots throughout contemporary Scotland but also that significant number of those living in Scotland do not use Scots at all' (Dunlop 2002, p. 6). Lochhead also explores the narratives from a similar point of view but for the psychological richness of the characters she applies poetic techniques and psychological themes. For example, she employs the theme of adults playing children in a non-realistic setting with the intention of accomplishing specific emotional layering. In *MQS*, it is a means to reflect upon the effeminate reading of the national identity question by the contemporary Scottish society, which in the 1970s failed the Referendum for Scottish independence and was divided by still active religious bigotry. Furthermore, Dunlop summarises that the play was greatly indebted to the Scots literary tradition. He consciously and

intentionally simplified and limited the language in order to facilitate the audience's understanding (Dunlop 2002, p. 8). Such inferiorist thinking comes from the established literary traditions in Scottish theatre to which Lochhead opposes with a more poetic form of Scots.

Morgan takes the linguistic experiment a step further with two of his adaptations of French classical tragedies (*Phaedra* and *Cyrano*) with revised Scots as an attempt to use the demotic idiom from the Central Belt as classical language. Such a project is not of interest to Lochhead either (*Medea*). However, the psychological depth of the Scottish cultural experience is present in both playwrights' (Morgan and Lochhead) adaptations after 2000 as well as the creative approach to the language (demotic Glaswegian).

The need of a project to develop tragic form in Scottish theatre is both due to the lack of tradition of staging Greek plays in Scotland before 2000, as Corbett claims, and the dominant music hall comedy culture. There were only few futile attempts of adapting Greek comedies in the 1950s and 1960s as part of the second wave of Scottish Renaissance.

The first translator of Greek plays, Douglas Young, was hugely influenced by the work of Kemp on French comedies. Young was a brilliant Greek scholar and a defender of Scots language. He translated *The Frogs* and *The Birds*, two of Aristophanes comedies, into broad Scots in 1958 and 1959. *The Puddocks* and *The Burdies* did not receive public enthusiasm due to the complex interpretation of the original. According to Findlay, on the one hand, the Greek texts were unfamiliar to the Scottish audience (Findlay 2004, p. 215). On the other, the dominant colloquial register of different styles and idiosyncratic lexicon of the poet Young created a complex text with 'historical references and major literary figures of the past' (Findlay 2004, p.219).

The director of the Royal Lyceum Theatre, Tom Fleming, gave a professional reading of *The Burdies* in 1966. The Scottish audiences watched a star quality performance by actors Duncan Macrae, Fulton Mackay, Callum Mill and Lennox

Milne (Findlay 2000, p. 73). Young received some critical retorts in which his Lallans was called 'plastic Scots' because of the difficulty of communicating to the audience. Most of the Renaissance poets do not write the way they speak, which is seen as a predicament by the critics in 1966 (Findlay 2000, pp. 85-86). *The Burdies* became one of the most controversial productions at the Fringe that year. That forced Young to compile and publish a response to the critics 'Scots Birds and Edinburgh Reviewers: A Case Study in Theatre Critics and Their Contradictions' (1966) in order to defend his translation and choice of language.

Findlay considers Young's approach pragmatic – he created a Scottish-Greek hybrid in order to marry the fidelity of the letters to the true spirit of the free adaptation into contemporary Scotland (Findlay 2000, p. 91). Young uses not only a mixture of registers (synthetic form with contemporary vocabulary and colloquialisms) but also introduces traditional images and allusions to Scottishness from the popular (whisky, tartan, etc) to the specific cultural traits. Derek McClure is more critical of Young and his translations, which received mixed reactions from audiences and critics. The major predicament, in the opinion of the critic, lies in the alienness and incompatibility of cultures (2004, pp. 215 - 217). Overall, the contribution of Young could be described as a development of a stage Scots that incorporates a range of registers, inclusive of a colloquial Scots. Such an example will be followed by other Scottish translators of Greek playtexts later.

Contrary to Brown's view of Scots as metadramatic language, Corbett and Scullion view the tradition of mixing registers by Scottish playwrights as an expression of cultural hybridity of an open and inclusive national identity model. Morgan, Lochhead, McGrath and Greig explore the question with their revisions of Greek tragedies after 2000 and present it as not entirely agreeable.

Lorna Hardwick interprets the political potential of the classics as an 'articulation of anti-colonialist ideas and as a forum for the exploration of post-colonial debates about the relationships between cultural and political identities' (2004, p. 219). The scholar views the subject informed by Franz Fanon's study of the relationship



between the masses and the neo-colonial elite with the potential to reflect upon ‘constructions of nationalisms which reinforce the notion of the colonised self and occlude differences between indigenous socio-political groups’ (Hall 2004, p. 220). However, in the Scottish context, those two identities: political and cultural, have often been merged and used interchangeably in the national rhetoric. Hall claims that the political potential of this kind of function of the tragedies depends on the selection of plays. In general, *Antigone* is frequently revised for commentaries or debate about war and political/nationalistic conflicts, whereas *Medea* is generally revisited with the idea of studying post-colonial identities (Hall 2004, pp. 23-24).

Hardwick suggests that, in Scotland, the revisiting of the classics has been used as a forum ‘for encouraging new forms of democratic consciousness (in the work of TAG’s *Antigone* (2000)) and has been subtle in its questioning of easy distinctions between colonisers and colonised (theatre babel, especially Greig’s *Oedipus*) (2004, p. 220). Lochhead’s *Medea* also brings similar subtle reading of the relationship ‘coloniser – colonised’, but, as mentioned earlier, the playwright deconstructs the democratic consciousness as highly politicised public space in Scotland, which results in the frequent fusion of the two images.

Morgan’s adaptation of Racine’s classical work titled *Phaedra* was produced by the Royal Lyceum theatre in 2000 by director Kenny Ireland. The poet and playwright’s work is informed by the radical 1960s development of Glaswegian Scots as a vehicle for poetry and is also a continuation of his previous translation for the theatre of Rostand’s *Cyrano de Bergerac*<sup>xiii</sup>. In the latter, Morgan takes on the advantages and potential in urban Glaswegian compared to the synthetic Scots offered before by Young, Kemp and MacDiarmid and the heavy burden of historicity that it has been loaded with by the recent development of plays in Scots after 1970s. Morgan’s translation of *Phèdre* is close to the original with increased emphasis on the richness of the Scots medium:

I wanted to bring out what was really there – a very passionate play ... I think people in Britain tend to have a set perception of a French classics as being very cold with restrained style. I want to get away from this and make the characters as real and believable as possible. (*Programme Notes* 2002)

Morgan changes one more of the already established conventions of transposition and decides not to transfer the play into a Scottish context but to keep it in Greece. The stage design of Isla Shaw follows the translator's concept closely. The performance space narrates the effect of a theatre-in-the-round, built on a level with the Grand Circle (with safety-net). Apart from linking the interior and exterior worlds, Shaw's design aims at creating 'the feeling of an island or a castle and of the way Phaedra is imprisoned by her emotions or her fate' (Hardwick 2002a). The vivid visuality and psychological portrayal, seeking a direct emotional link with the audience, is an inherited poetic function of Scots, as Witting's argument states, and is utilised also by Lochhead and Anthony Nielson in their own creative work. The visualisation of the internal world also follows the performance trends at the time.

Hardwick evaluates the work of Morgan by looking into the round-table discussions with two experts: Professor Peter France (Edinburgh) and Professor Alain Viala (Paris). Hardwick views Morgan's project as significant because it shows the relation between Scottish theatre and classical theatre (in the broadest sense, French classical theatre) and also it demonstrates the ability of Scots language to be used as classical language. The message that comes to the contemporaries is a woman not only of declared passions but also charged with strong eroticism. The director shares that both he and the lead actress Gerda Stevenson felt that the Jansenist concerns in Racine's play had some potentially Scottish implications in the way that they drew on underlying feelings about what people should and should not do:

If you're Scottish, then the 'Wee Free' Presbyterian Church seems about the closest you can get – the same kind of severe fundamentalism. (Hardwick 2002a)

Along with the issues of female sexuality, Morgan faces another challenge – the theatrical use of Scots in the comedy genre. He employs it with the idea to underline and show the streaks of black humour in the play, e.g. when Phaedra laments that she never got Hippolytus into bed. Further linguistic issues present the demotic, working class roots of Glaswegian Scots, thus bringing into question the status of the protagonists in the play (in Racine they are close to the status of gods) and their

representation on stage. This cultural friction, in the view of Hardwick, forces Morgan to revisit the Greek Hippolytus and offer some modern elements:

Theseus wore heavy boots with thick soles, Velcro fastenings and spurs which made him look like a cross between Hermes and a Biker. Both Hippolytus and Theseus were tattooed: Hippolytus had a barbed wire tattoo on his arm, Theseus a prominent tattoo depicting Poseidon and a sea-monster. Together with the leather thongs on his wrists, this added to the 'macho' image, reinforced by the physicality of David Rintoul's performance. Phaedra wore a striking red dress (which in Scottish theatre in spring 2000 seemed to be *de rigueur* for passionate women; compare Medea's costume in Liz Lochhead's version). (Hardwick 2002a)

The audience at the round-table discussion felt that the translator and director had dismissed Racine and went back to Euripides. The language is not very elevated; the staging resembles more Athenian theatre than a production of Comédie-Française and the 'friction between contemporary and mythical resonances, and the not-terribly-reverent view of the gods' (Hardwick 2002). Hardwick further clarifies in her article that such a revision did not happen but the reception is significant as it raises 'interesting questions about how refiguration can reveal layers of source texts which have been suppressed or marginalised in intervening receptions' (Hardwick 2002). In particular, Morgan hoped that the shock of cultural friction would 'bring the characters back alive' (Hardwick 2002a). Another questionable aspect of Morgan's project is why he did not go back to the Greek originals but stayed with the French classical works. Classical expert Rush Rehm suggests that Greek tragedy was elevated in style and language but at the same time it was 'grounded in a festival context integral to the on-going life of the city' (not seen as high art for an interpretive elite) (Rehm 1992, p. 19). The not very elevated language and the irreverent view of the gods can be applied for defining the old form of Greek comedy, especially in the works of Aristophanes, possibly what the Scottish audience seem to have detected in the play – its comic potential. Rehm says that in order to keep the audience alive to the fact of performance, Greek tragedians would involve dramatic irony and humour and would also call attention to a more complex sense of dramatic representation and illusion by referring to (even parodying) scenes from earlier tragedies (Rehm 1992, p. 47). For instance, 'Euripides systematically involves the audience in this kind of dialectical relationship, alternating between their belief in

the illusion of the play and their awareness that they are part of the process by which that illusion occurs' (Rehm 1992, p. 48).

Furthermore, what Morgan achieves can be described by Hardwick's view of 'performance slide' into contemporary staging of the classics by turning them into popular art (2002b). Following a recent paper 'Staging Agamemnon: the languages of translation' (2001), Hardwick explores recent emphases in performance of classical plays through verbal adaptation in conjunction with the non-verbal languages of theatre for the specific audiences (2002b). Hardwick's point of view of the modern staging of *Electra* focuses on the special performance emphasis on the exploration of human suffering which resonates with the main topic of *Phaedra*. If in Morgan's version the 'popularisation' of Racine's text was achieved both through literary, verbal means, and performance, non-verbal, the two Scottish productions Hardwick studies employ non-verbal stage effects in order to shape the specific perceptions of the play. The *theatre babel* production in the version of Tom McGrath 'addressed the relationship between the domestic and the political resonances of Sophocles' play by the use of non-verbal sound to convey the emotional registers of the characters.' (Hardwick 2002b) The integration of cello music (Chrysothemis' narrative of Clytemnestra's dream) as a commentary on the emotional mood and dramatic action later on combined with percussion sounds. This accompanied Clytemnestra's tale about the sacrifice of Iphigenia, mixed with the vocal choral whispers and the visual military dressing and countenance of Electra mounted to the tensed contest between the domestic and the political in the translator's (MacLaren) view. Here again the main problem of interpretation of the contemporary Scottish community is that it is viewed as preserving the clear divide between those two dimensions: the domestic and the public, which for Lochhead is a cultural hybrid.

Greek tragedians, according to Rehm, were not solely playwrights but also directors and choreographers and their ability to put all those diverse skills into performance were the target of the ancient contents in Athens (Rehm 1992, p. 25). For example, 'Euripides was not the first to use costume (dressed in rags, etc) and props to suggest suffering and deprivation'; often 'costume, props and a corpse come together at key

dramatic moments to reveal a concentrated image of the central action' (Rehm 1992, pp. 66-67).

Therefore, Hardwick's invention of the term 'performance slide' contains the revision of the original performances. However, it also suggests a broadening in the performance elements in translation in order to establish and communicate an intellectual and emotional experience to the audience, which does not recreate the original perception by the ancient Greek audiences (Hardwick 2002b). Such is the second adaptation of *Electra* in 1999 Scotland by Cathy Boyd for Theatre Cryptic that worked with the version of Clare Venables. The play had the subtitle 'A Queen of Revenge'. Kate Dickie, in the title role, wore rags, which were progressively removed. In *The Scotsman* (1999), photos of the same production show Electra with a shaven head with 'revenge' written on her skull, while in other performances she appeared wearing a spiky cropped wig. According to Hardwick and the director, those images created levels of visual and aural intimacy and distance. The production used modern media technologies to construct tender contact between Electra and Orestes, who appeared two-dimensional as two red eyes on the screen, whereas the Chorus had no bodily but only vocal presence, which assisted the feminist, psychological point of the director (Hardwick 2002b; Burke 2002).

Sophocles' *Electra* has not been challenged enough and there were political issues that *theatre babel* tried to show. Tom McGrath was attracted by the strong female protagonist in the play and, following Sophocles work, preserved the strong familial relationships. However, he felt that a contemporary reading of the play requires a contemporary setting, so he exchanged the royal palace for a modern multi-storey city hotel. Electra's hard qualities seemed to be echoed by the harsh desperation of the street girls of the present. In order to construct the image of the protagonist he used a real person – AungSan Su Kyi and her struggle in Burma. Su Kyi was under arrest in her house, loyal to her people and the memory of her father. That is where the resemblance ended – Su Kyi was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize and Electra was left hostile and depressed. McGrath faced a real challenge with the adaptation of the play as he strove to give a realistic portrayal of a character. Furthermore, his personal

philosophy of non-violence contradicted the endless violent ritual performed in the play. Additionally, the fact that Electra's desire for revenge for her father's murder has never been challenged by the other characters in the play, was something that contradicted the views of the playwright.

David Greig created something close to intercultural theatre, which did not offer in its end a direct reflection on contemporary Scottish society. Having created a free intellectual adaptation that distanced itself from the original in setting, characterisation and themes, Greig served *Oedipus, The Visionary* as an opposition to the 'In-Yer-Face' drama that flooded the British new theatre writing at the time. There is not only a genre opposition in Greig's work but also an element of alienation with the use of the twentieth-century landscape of Matibo Drakensberg mountains of South Africa as the setting for ancient Thebes. In the foreword of the published play Greig informs the readers that mainly his experiences in Lesotho, contemporary Africa and his encounter with AIDS cases and their supernatural explanations by the locals, reminded him of the ancient Greek world where *Oedipus Rex* is set. Greig's version of the play is universal and engages with global issues of political power, economics and society especially in his interpretation of the Chorus. It represents different elements of society at different times (a mob, villagers, rich, poor, etc), who sometimes are individualised as Man 1 and Woman 1, and those choices, in the words of the playwright (Greig 2000), should be respected by the producers. However, for Hardwick, it is the most highly politicised version of the three plays from the Greeks project. Although the same basic set is used for each of the plays – a mid-blue backcloth which the lighting design tinges with pink at the lower level, and incorporates with this a plain entrance which has the appearance of an upright *stele* – for Greig's play there is a dead tree at the rear and a ritual circle in the middle for taking auspices. In the view of Hardwick, Greig's play is raw and uncluttered; the audience is addressed directly as Oedipus's people, who seek his protection as he himself is protected by god. Greig deconstructs this situation with the rest of the play and brings out the original ironies (Hardwick 2002a). The African setting and references, which Greig describes in the foreword to the published text, are replaced in the 2000 production with Indian setting and clothing

to introduce otherness and historical distance. According to Hardwick, the power relationship of colonised and coloniser is revealed through the complex relationship between Oedipus and Creon, whose roles of usurper and liberator 'fluctuated' in the play. In The programme notes, Greig says: 'It is not Sophocles' work but nor is it entirely mine. It belongs neither to Greek culture nor to Scots. It is neither truly old nor truly new. It is a hybrid, a mongrel creation. But mongrelisation is, of course, the secret of survival in a species' (Hardwick 2002a), thus referring to modern Scottish identity as culturally hybrid and changing.

Hardwick's interest in the link between Greek tragedy and anti-colonialism goes beyond Western theatre and leaves Scottish experience at the periphery of the question. However, in a separate essay, she revisits it in order to explore in depth the subject (Hardwick 2002a). In it, she dismisses Lochhead's *Medea* as a political debate of post-colonialism in Scotland and focuses on Greig's adaptation of *Oedipus* as representative. Along with it, Hardwick also views Morgan's version of *Phaedra* as a significant marker because both of the adaptations challenge the established theatrical conventions. Hardwick's choice is governed by the idea that both present cultural interaction of civic and national identity, which, apart from being distinctively Scottish, 'are not parochial or inward looking' (Hardwick 2002a). Moreover, they are also the most radical, which allow Hardwick to reflect upon the communication between the present and past performances of Greek tragedies.

Greig, similarly to other Scottish dramatists, often perceives himself as an exile, generally interpreted as sharing a problematic Scottish identity. In support of this argument, Scottish audiences very recently added another exile to the list along with Greig: [Stewart Laing](#) (director of [The Salon Project](#) 2011 and [Ten Plagues](#) 2011) by accusing him of being pro-European (fearing ethnic nationalistic ideas). The unsettled question of Scottishness in post-Devolution Scotland is a counter argument to Paterson's belief in the increased individual autonomy, to the extent of there being no need of national identity in contemporary Scotland.

The same year, similar sentiments stirred a public debate ‘Is there such a thing as a Scottish play?’ organised by the National Theatre of Scotland (NTS) (Fisher 2011). The debate is included in the *Guardian* theatre blog and came as a result of public accusations at NTS for not nourishing home-grown drama. The audience asked the central question of ‘What is Scottishness?’. The event was chaired by Ian Brown with panel members the playwright David Greig and Paul Henderson Scott, who tirelessly requested NTS to go back to the Scottish classics in Scots.

Perhaps that is why, although Scottish adaptations of Shakespeare are rare, one of the most frequently revisited classical plays is Shakespeare’s *Macbeth*, or the Scottish play. It has received two translations into Scots by Robin Lorimer and David Purves. Both are faithful versions to the original, from which only Lorimer’s translation has been performed in front of audience, firstly in 1995 (forty minutes excerpts) and a full production in 2012 by the Edinburgh Theatre Arts Group.

David Greig’s adaptation of *Macbeth – Dunsinane* (2011) is an ambitious work claiming to have revised the play with the questionable initial intentions of Shakespeare, i.e. to apply Gaelic. The play received high media success despite the literal scenography and huge cultural gap between the English and Gaelic communities which was disapprovingly criticised by Mike Duffy and Lorna (Duffy & Dixon 2012).

Shakespeare has received much more attention by women adaptors in Scotland than men. For instance Joan Ure’s adaptations *Something in it for Cordelia* and *Something in it for Ophelia* already discussed in the previous chapter. Lochhead’s adaptation of *The Tempest* for children in 1993 for the Unicorn Theatre in London and in 1995 for TAG titled *The Magic Island*, in many respects kept the major links and themes of the original. It also emerged as an equally exciting and new work on its own. The story is retold from Miranda’s point of view in which the theme of friendship replaces love. The applied fairy tale convention of a happy end – even Caliban finds a new friend, is acceptable and appropriate for the audience age group of 4-8 year olds. In an interview with Carla Rodríguez González Lochhead openly states that



she is not a translator but an adaptor who makes versions of plays (González 2004, p. 102). When dealing with Molière she is as faithful as possible whereas in every other case she adapts freely from the original. This partially is due to the fact that on the one hand, she is conscious of working in Robert Kemp's tradition of adaptation of the French classicist. On the other, all other plays she approaches as universal stories with the idea of individual production specifics and constraints, which influence her choice of character, staging, etc. (González 2004, p. 103).

Apart from placing language in the centre, the nationalist trend also attempts at a restoration of the tragic form in theatre. The internationalists rely more on the performance elements and explore and extend the comic form by revisioning sources of black humour such as folkloric, balladic, etc. As previously mentioned, Lochhead does not belong directly to any of the trends but employs the deconstructive powers of Scots in the redefinition of socially constructed identities and transgresses them to performance forms.

Traditionally, the question of performance is an intrinsic part of the study of theatrical adaptations and in Scotland its roots should be sought in the comic form. The pioneer work of Kemp had influenced a lot of Scottish dramatists, among them Victor Carin, Hector MacMillan, and Liz Lochhead. They all produce adaptations of Molière's texts post 1980s.

According to Noel Peacock, it is not accidental that Molière's translations flourished during the years of Thatcherism. The classicist's sharp satire of social manners and behaviour is reinforced by the comic potential of Scots and the reflections of the Scottish in the contemporary social mirror. It is worth studying the adaptation techniques those adaptors applied.

Victor Carin adapted *The Hypochondriak* (1963) for the Gateway theatre, *The Servant O'Twa maisters* (1965) for the Lyceum Theatre, and *The Chippit Chantie* by Heinrich von Kleist for the Dundee Rep (1974). Carin used English translations for all of them, the last one was only translated by a German student who pleaded with him to prepare a version into Scots.

Carin's drive was an interest in preserving and developing Scots similarly to his colleagues at the Gateway. He undertook the translation of *the Hypochondriack* solely due to the reduced number of plays into Scots (Findlay 2000, p. 117). Carin was lucky to work with a comedian in the scale of Duncan Macrae – Walter Carr. The play was adapted into broad Scots (traditional) with the influence of pantomime. Russel Hunter, who performed in Mitchell's *The Lower Depths*, performed also in Carin's play *The Servant o-Twa Maisters* at the Lyceum (Findlay 2000, p. 120). All of these artists supported the idea of a national theatre.

In the *Hypochondriack* Carin employed vernacular traditional Scots deprived of class references. He used stylistic variety of register shades between vernacular and high/literary forms, which did not bring him to English – all his characters remained Scots speakers (Findlay 2000, p. 135). Although Carin's stage Scots is based on traditional Scots similarly to Kemp and Young, he also applies a much more colloquial speech.

*The Misanthrope* by Hector MacMillan was attempted as a challenge. MacMillan found out that the English translations are not very close to the original text of Molière. He used rhyming couplets and set the play in the eighteenth century. His Scots is hugely derived from Lallans, laced with French and Latinisms. His next adaptation *Le Bourgeois Gentilhomme* (performed by the Royal Lyceum Theatre in 1987) is set in eighteenth-century Edinburgh in the hall of a vast establishment. MacMillan broadens the target of Molière's humour. The true aristocrats are shown as not in control of the situation; the shallowness of the aristocratic ideal is itself a source of MacMillan's irony. *The Imaginary Invalid* is set a year after the death of Molière in Paris. *The Hypochondriack* is a Scots version set in Argan's home in Edinburgh towards the end of seventeenth century. It was a muchcondemned version, produced by the Royal Lyceum theatre and King's theatre in 1987.

Lochhead's initial intention for *Tartuffe* is to render the play into English for Scottish actors, so *Tartuffe* and the invented stage Scots come as a surprise (Findlay 2000, p.142). Lochhead relies on the bilingualism of the characters and the already adopted

technique of mixing registers (especially register contrasting by *Tartuffe*). In this sense, her practice links, with the work of Kemp, Young and Carin, to the use a variety of registers as a dramatic device. *Tartuffe* is a preparation for the original work into complete Scots of *MQS* a year later. Findlay sees Lochhead's motivation as forging a female Scottish working class voice in theatre (Findlay 2000, p. 149). Along with the demotic Scots of the central belt, Lochhead applies an experienced ear for the Scottish speech rhythms (inevitably coming from her work and experience as a poet). She blends demotic Glaswegian Scots with the Scots from different eras, which support the notion that she does it with the aim of performance (disrupted historical, etc. continuities) more rather than to contribute to the cultural hybridity/multiculturalism debate.

Randall Stevenson looks at the work of the dramatist from a linguistic and cultural perspective. Lochhead's *Tartuffe* along with the religious, encompasses the question of political hypocrisy<sup>xiv</sup> and demonstrates a good ear for contemporary social and political issues. According to Stevenson, her version resonates current political debates of the 1980s, whose clear references would not be missed by the Scottish audiences (2004, p. 107). This interest in the contemporary political and social climate and its artistic performance has been a direct influence from the playwright's poetic credo and practice.

Lochhead produces three other adaptations based on Molière's plays: *Les Precieuses Ridicules*, *Le Misanthrope*, and *L'Ecole des Femmes*. In 1989 she presents *The Patter Merchants* (*Les Precieuses Ridicules*) as a part from a double bill with John Clifford's *The Magic Theatre* derived from Cervantes, entitled *Professional Pretenders*. Lochhead chooses a late twentieth-century Scotland for the context of the play. Later on, in 2002, a new translation/adaptation of *Le Misanthrope* by the same author, titled *Miseryguts*, was performed at the Royal Lyceum Theatre in Edinburgh. The play, differently to the adaptation of *Tartuffe*, is fully transposed to modern times and the characters are turned into media rats following a modern plotline of political corruption. This version is not adapted into Scots and received a warm reception.

One of the latest adaptations of Lochhead, and second version of the play in Scots, is *Educating Agnes* (2008). After Robert Kemp's first translation in 1948, Lochhead's approach to *L'Ecole des Femmes* is completely different (in a way a response to Kemp's title in broad Scots, which can be translated as 'Hey women, be careful, be aware'). Faithful to her writing style, she preserves the rhyming of Molière and transposes the setting to Scotland with no specific historical reference, although the contemporised language refers to the current historical moment.

Lochhead's published texts after *MQS* include the *mise-en-scene* element in the text, which brings aspects of dramaturgy to her work. However, the included elements of dramaturgy are not always her own work, as in the case of *MQS*. Alison Peebles in interview with me shared that most of the stage directions in the published version of the play came from the Communicado theatre members during their workshops (Peebles 2012). In her latest adaptations after 2000, part of the subtext is stored in the stage directions which definitely speaks that Lochhead had approached the original with a dramaturgical mind. For instance, in *Educating Agnes* (2008), in the stage directions to the first scene between Arnolphe and Agnes, Arnolphe rounds his mouth and closes his eyes for a kiss. Agnes, however, gives him only a peck on the cheek. Such developments by Lochhead are certainly dictated by her writer's goals – to stay faithful to the MacMolière tradition of bringing pantomime vibes and more physicality to suit the traditional training of Scottish comedy actors.

The conventional/traditional adaptation techniques in Scottish theatre consist of domestication, a cultural and/or linguistic transposition, employment of humour with the aim of contemporary social satire (both in comic and tragic forms), and increased physicality/viscerality on stage with the aims of passionate, direct emotional impact on the audience very often achieved with poetic means, the feminine aspect of the Scottish identity discussed in Chapter Two.

The dominant techniques of transposition speak of Scullion's earlier remark about the preserved strong focus on national identity of Scottish theatre after the

Devolution. The comical is still sought as a form of political comment and social satire of the contemporary Scottish culture.

Women playwrights continue to work in the conventional framework of adaptation in Scottish theatre – namely of cultural and/or linguistic transposition in order to either contemporise and politicise the theme with local cultural flavour, or to reflect upon social change in the past with subtle reference to the present. For instance, similarly to Lochhead's adaptation *Miseryguts*, Rona Murno transposes Federico Garcia Lorca's play *The House of Bernarda Alba* for the NTS in 2009 to the present in the East End Glasgow communities and replaces the theme of sexuality with lack of love. Reviewer Joyce McMillan shares:

As a scenario, Munro's new version of the play places a sharp stretch on the original drama; some in the audience are clearly inclined to take this mouthy Glasgow Lorca as a kind of pastiche, too much like an episode of Taggart for comfort. And Siobhan Redmond, in the role of Bernie, has to struggle with the loss of the huge symbolic weight carried by the original *Bernarda Alba*. (McMillan 2009)

The reviewer Anna Bradley for the *TVbomb* sees it as a radical updating of the classical text with whose characters you can hardly sympathise. Shona Craven from *OnStageScotland* describes it as 'a bloodless, plodding affair that's almost completely lacking in dramatic tension' (Craven 2009).

Zinnie Harris' adaptation of Strindberg's *Miss Julie* prepared and directed by Harris for the National Theatre of Scotland in 2006 relocates the play to Central Scotland between the wars. This new version complied with the already established practice by NTS dramatists to work with literal translations. Similarly to Lochhead's adaptation of Chekhov's *Three Sisters* (2000), the play explores the themes of class and gender, and reflects upon the social change and the unwillingness of Miss Julie to leave her class. Shona Craven finds Harris' work compelling and well crafted (Craven 2006). Thom Dibdin from *The Stage* considers the text of the adaptation as setting the bar very high by successfully introducing an increased tension between the classes due to the strike at the background. However, the actual staging and

ending he defines as a let-down, which raises the question of performance as part of the adaptation process for the Scottish stage (Dibdin 2006).

Craven, who also reviewed Munro's performance of *The House of Alba*, points at similar stage challenges such as lack of dramatic tension. Lochhead's *Three Sisters* also receives harsh critical response due to the friction between two different cultural sensitivities (the English are not Russian!), which in the case of Lochhead is a productive ironic gap in the narrative. Lochhead also uses mirror images in order to bring out the irony in the play. Her adaptation in terms of choice of language is faithful to her style of colloquial speech but this version is dense with idiomaticised and slang vocabulary, English, Scottish and American, due to the framework of transposition she chooses to apply – Northern Scotland in the 1940s near an American military camp.

John Byrne's two adaptations of Chekhov are also set in the same part of Scotland with the same motif of social change. *Uncle Varick* (2004), an adaptation of *Uncle Vanya* performed at the Royal Lyceum Theatre in Edinburgh, is set in 1964 North Scotland and its characters speak the Scottish dialect. In this version directed by Tony Cownie, the main part is played by Brian Cox who brought an immediate sympathy to the character. Despite the Scottish flavour, reviewer Rachel Lynn Brody for the *British Theatre Guide* argues that 'it seems impossible to dislocate *Uncle Varick* from its Russian roots - and, sadly, this does not always work to the piece's advantage' (Brody 2004). For Edinburgh reviewer, Thelma Good from the *Edinburgh Guide*, 'Byrne's version of Chekov's *Uncle Vanya* is a fine new Scottish cousin to its much older Russian relation. There's real meat in the text and the well seasoned acting serves up a very memorable production' (Good 2004).

The collaboration between Byrne and the Lyceum director Tony Cownie continued with a second Chekhovian project this time *The Cherry Orchard* in 2009. Because director Cownie saw historical parallels with Russian history, the main theme of social change has been transposed by Byrne to the year 1979 with reflection on Thatcherist Scotland popularly known also with the name 'Winter of Discontent'. The director clarifies that Lenin and Thatcher have not been seen as political brothers but the analogy for social change has been the leading motif in the adaptation. It is

set in rural north east Scotland. Despite the mixed reviews received by both Chekhovian adaptation of Byrne's, the question of transposing drama to Scottish sets, in terms of performance, remains arguable.

More courageous steps in terms of adaptation techniques with an impact on performance are visibly traced in the work of male adaptors such as Morgan, Greig, Tom Leonard and Jo Clifford as some of the most representative names. Leonard, similarly to Morgan, shares strong interest in language but his adaptations are closer to Lochhead's metadramatic texts with a stronger emphasis on self-reflexivity compared to Morgan's preoccupation with the expansion of the language idiom.

Leonard's *Uncle Vanya* (2002), an adaptation of Chekhov with theatre babel, received a high critical acclaim. As mentioned earlier, only a small part of the adapted playtexts have been academically studied and acknowledged, and Leonard's work on the Chekhovian text deserves further critical attention.

Timothy Ramsden, who saw the performance at Theatre Royal York during the English part of the tour, wrote in the *Edinburgh Guide* that it 'stands out for its intelligence and integrity. It's a pacey show – no lingering wistfulness but snappy human relationships' (Ramsden 2002). Leonard himself shares his adaptation technique which is equally creative and Scottish in its base in 'Translating "Uncle Vanya": A Programme Note'. He starts with his personal experience of Chekhov's short stories and the music they imparted to him, which is even more present in the plays:

Uncle Vanya can be seen as an octet - but not a romantic if sturdy dying- fall piece by Brahms or Tchaikovsky. (Leonard 2002, p. 155)

He further explains that the director Graham McLaren asked him to produce a speakable version for his actors and preserve the Russian names of places without transposing the action to another place, especially not Scotland. Thus Leonard felt that the place should become the theatrical drama itself (2002, p. 156). He started with looking for each character's voice individually within his own sense of linguistic music rather a translation of each act as a unit:

Using the Penguin edition, translated by Elisaveta Fen in 1953-4, I marked a line in the margin when each character had more than a sentence or two to say to the listener.... The play kept opening up inward, mirror against mirror. And it's a comedy! Or is it? (Leonard 2002, p. 157)

Greig is a representative of the cultural/internationalist trend, whose intellectual texts question Scottish identity from a very different angle (a cultural exile often seen as pro-European intellectual) and create something close to intercultural theatre. Cathy Boyd's production of *Electra* (1999) is also worth mentioning in its ingenuity in applying dramaturgical devices for new characterisation. For instance, Boyd presents the Chorus as voices solely, and Orestes as a two dimensional character (two red eyes) with the help of contemporary multimedia.

Jo Clifford's rich history of adaptation grabs with its eclectics and depth. Clifford has both translated and adapted literary and dramatic texts from Spanish speaking countries but not exclusively. One of her remarkable achievements is the adaptation from German of the two parts of Goethe's *Faust* in 2006, the second part of the original exceptionally famous for its unstageability. The adaptation has a double resonance: firstly with the current political situation at the time, and secondly with the major changes in the playwright's life which defines her as an exile on the Scottish stage – the issues of transsexuality. Her engagement with the original wasn't literal but spirit-catching:

A major concern of the play is how we relate to the feminine within all of us. Goethe was hundreds of years ahead of his time – even ahead of our own time – in that... (Fisher 2006)

Her latest two adaptations are for Theatre Alba both performed at Duddingston Kirk Loch – Chekhov's *The Seagull* (2010) with mixed reception and *The Cherry Orchard* (2011) for which reviewer Joyce McMillan does not spare flattering words. In conclusion, the post-devolution period in Scottish theatre continues to place a prime significance on the question of national identity and applies adaptations of the classics as a main tool for self-reflexivity introduced with the intercultural model of Pavis.

Lorna Hardwick reads the revision of the classics in Scotland after 2000 as part of the forum for post-colonial debates with focus on the relationships between cultural and political identities. In its essence, this is a contrived argument since traditionally



those two identities were merged and often used interchangeably in the Scottish national debate. Along with the verbal means of anti-colonialist techniques, which for the proponents of the literary trend is of great importance, Hardwick draws the attention to the non-verbal ones in Scottish adaptations and treats them as part of the global theatrical shift into performance, a phenomenon she calls 'performance slide'. The second, non-verbal, trend is not so powerfully supported by the Scottish adaptors of the Greek plays due to the predominant approach of fidelity to the original and the dominant comic dramatic form. Some of the main issues of tragedy adapting were raised by Lochhead, for whom the main function of studying the democratic consciousness in Scotland as a political debate between the public and private is obstructed by the socially reformed Scottish community and highly politicised private space. This makes it difficult to clearly distinguish between the two spaces. This argument is further reinforced by studying the cultural difference as sexual which, in Kristeva's view, reflects the institutionalised gender difference in the Western national debate. According to Kristeva, women are devoid of identity and presented through the maternal and due to it are either desexualised or discarded punished body by the symbolic.

Most of the adaptations are close translations of the plot and characterisation with slight alterations – mainly with modernisation elements and cultural references to meet the adaptor's intentions. The first theatre adaptations dealt mainly with the comic form and used Scots and domestication techniques as part of the nationalistic discourse and in compliance with Kemp's model for indigenous theatre, with the project of national theatre in mind. The later theatre adaptors challenged the established language and genre tradition by expanding the linguistic idiom from literary and synthetic forms to more contemporary (Leonard) and colloquial registers (Lochhead). This looked to the extreme experiment of establishing Scots as a classical language by Morgan with the adaptation of Racine's tragic play *Phaedre* in 2000.

The traditional model of adaptation of the classics started by Kemp suggested transposition of the setting and use of Scots, both of which are gradually abandoned

by the group of contemporary playwrights supporting internationalist's views about Scottish culture.

Lochhead as an adaptor excludes herself as a translator of the classics. It is also difficult to classify her according to existing trends. Her general approach of formal transgression genres, plots and characterisation follow the process of establishment of the new post-colonial model of nationalism in Scotland, which is a revised old nationalist model (formally transgressed). In it the English self is replaced with the international self. This new self, in most of the radical examples approximates the imaginary, fantastic traits of the stage Scots. This leads to higher self-reflexivity with a shift from language to performance as dramaturgical means of expanding the theatrical traditions of the comic form and exploring the dark humour layers in the tragic forms of the classical Greek plays. For instance, Morgan's *Phaedra* (2000) remains set in Greece, however, all of the characters are contemporaries and certain dark comical moments in the play are revived with the help of the demotic Urban Glaswegian language. Leonard's *Uncle Vanya* places the action somewhere between Scotland and Russia, in the body of the dramatic text itself, which creates a highly experimental musical interpretation of the original again with the idea of fidelity to the spirit of Chekhov's work. Greig's adaptation of *Oedipus* also places the action in some imaginary space, which holds the visual references with Africa but is also resonant to Scottish and Greek culture. The characters of the play are also depicted as contemporaries of the audience. Greig is perhaps the only one who breaks the tradition of fidelity to the text/or spirit of the original, by suggesting a politicised version of the classics as an intellectual retort to a fashionable theatrical movement at that time: 'in yer face drama'.

Chekhov's texts prove to be fruitful for the cultural images of social change with repeated preference of transposition – the North of Scotland, and specific exploration of the dark comic elements of the original as John Byrne's adaptations *Uncle Varick* and the *Cherry Orchard* suggest.

Lochhead's versatile adaptations can be generalised as a common attempt at contemporisation, with specific focus on language and irony. She stayed faithful to

the traditional Scottish form of comedy performance, i.e. with consciously increased physicality of the characters on stage, but not always faithfully reading of the original plot and characterisation.

## References:

BRADLEY, A., 2009. Review of *The House of Bernarda Alba* by Rona Munro. NTS at King's theatre, Edinburgh. *TVbomb*. [online]. 4 November. [viewed 30 April 2013]. Available from: <http://www.tvbomb.co.uk/?p=863> .

BRODY, R. L., 2004. Review of *Uncle Varick* by John Byrne. Royal Lyceum Theatre, Edinburgh. The *British Theatre Guide*. [online]. [viewed 30 April 2013]. Available from: <http://www.britishtheatreguide.info/reviews/unclevarick-rev>.

BROWN, I., December 2000. 'Scots and Welsh: Theatrical Translation and Theatrical Languages'. *IJoST*. [online]. vol.1, no2. Queen Margaret University. [viewed 15 June 2012]. Available from: [http://www.arts.gla.ac.uk/scotlit/asls/ijost/Volume1\\_no2/I\\_Brown.htm](http://www.arts.gla.ac.uk/scotlit/asls/ijost/Volume1_no2/I_Brown.htm).

BURKE, A., 2002. 'Characterising the Chorus: Individual and Collective in Four Recent Productions of Greek Tragedy'. Open University. [online]. [viewed 3 February 2010]. Available from: <http://www2.open.ac.uk/ClassicalStudies/GreekPlays/Seminar02/AlisonFinal.htm>.

CORBETT, J., 1999. *Written in the Language of the Scottish Nation*. Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data .

CRAVEN, S., 2006. 'Julie'. Review of *Miss Julie* by Zinnie Harris. North Edinburgh Arts Centre. *OnStageScotland*. [online]. [viewed 30 April 2013]. Available from: <http://www.onstagescotland.co.uk/reviews/julie/>.

CRAVEN, S., 2009. Review of *The House of Bernarda Alba* by Rona Munro. Citizen's Theatre, Glasgow. *OnStageScotland*. [online]. [viewed 30 April 2013]. Available from: [http://www.onstagescotland.co.uk/reviews/the\\_house\\_of\\_bernada\\_alba/](http://www.onstagescotland.co.uk/reviews/the_house_of_bernada_alba/).

DIBDIN, T., 2006. 'Julie'. Review of *Miss Julie* by Zinnie Harris. NTS. *The Stage*. [online]. 13 September. [viewed 30 April 2013]. Available from: <http://www.thestage.co.uk/reviews/review.php/14115/julie>.

DUFFY, M. & L. DIXON, 2012. *Transcript*. Interview by M. Paraskevova. 05 April. North Berwick.

DUNLOP, B., 1991-1993. *Klytemnestra Bairns* *IJoST* [online]. pp.2- 8. [viewed 07 May 2012]. Available from: <http://journals.qmu.ac.uk/index.php/IJoST/article/view/50>.

FINDLAY, B., 2004. *Frae Ither Tongues*. Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data.

FINDLAY, B., 2000. *Motivation and Method in Scots Translations, Versions and Adaptations of Plays from the Historic Repertoire of Continental European Drama*. Unpublished PhD thesis. Queen Margaret University.

FISHER, M., 2006. 'Articles John Clifford (now Jo Clifford)' in *Theatre Scotland*. [online]. blog. February. [viewed 1 June 2013]. Available from: <http://www.theatrescotland.com/Scottish-theatre-writing/Articles/johnclifford.html>.

FISHER, M., 2011. 'Is there such a thing as a Scottish play?' The Theatre Blog with Lynn Gardner. *The Guardian*. [online]. 2 November. [viewed 30 April 2013]. Available from: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/stage/theatreblog/2011/nov/02/scottish-play-national-theatre-scotland>.

GREIG, D., 2000. *Oedipus the Visionary*. Glasgow Fruitmarket: Capercaillie Books Ltd.

GOOD, T., 2004. 'Fine new Scottish cousin to original'. Review of *Uncle Varick* by John Byrne. Royal Lyceum Theatre, Edinburgh. *The Edinburgh Guide*. [online]. 17 April. [viewed 30 April 2013]. Available from: [http://www.edinburghguide.com/aande/theatre/reviews\\_04\\_on/u/uncle\\_varick\\_rlt.shtml](http://www.edinburghguide.com/aande/theatre/reviews_04_on/u/uncle_varick_rlt.shtml).

GONZALEZ, C. R., June 2004. An Interview with Liz Lochhead in *ATLANTIS*. [online]. Vol. 26, no.1. pp. 101-110. Viewed 15 February 2009.

HALL, E., 2004. Introduction: Why Greek tragedy in Twentieth Century? In: HALL, MACINTOSH and WRIGLEY, eds. *Dionysus since 69: Greek Tragedy at the dawn of the third millennium*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 1-46.

HARDWICK, L., 2004. Greek Drama and Anti-colonialism: Decolonising the Classics In: HALL, MACINTOSH and WRIGLEY, eds. *Dionysus since 69: Greek Tragedy at the dawn of the third millennium*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 219-242.

HARDWICK, L., 2002a. 'Classical Theatre in Modern Scotland - A Democratic Stage?' *Open University*. [online]. [viewed 3 May 2011]. Available from: <http://www2.open.ac.uk/ClassicalStudies/GreekPlays/Seminar02/LHFinal.htm>

HARDWICK, L., 2002b. '*Electra* and the Theatre of Affliction: Towards a Textual Turn?' *Didaskalia*. [online]. [viewed 25 Feb 2012]. Available from: <http://www.didaskalia.net/issues/vol5no3/hardwick.html>.

LEONARD, T. (2010). 'Brecht's Mother Courage and her Children'. Tom Leonard's blog [online]. [viewed 30 April 2013]. Available from: <http://www.tomleonard.co.uk/journal/aug.html>.

LEONARD, T., 'Translating "Uncle Vanya": A Programme Note'. *Translation and Literature*. [on-line]. Vol. 12, No. 1, Modernism and Translation (Spring, 2003), pp.

155-158. Edinburgh University Press. [viewed 07 June 2012]. Available from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40340172>.

MCCLURE, D., 2004. *The Puddocks and the Burdies* 'by Aristophanes and Douglas Young' In: FINDLAY, B., ed. *Frae Ither Tongues*. Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data. pp. 215-230.

MCMILLAN, D. P., 1993. Liz Lochhead and the Ungentle Art of Clyping In: CRAWFORD, R. and A. VARTY, eds. *Liz Lochhead's Voices*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. pp. 17-37.

MCMILLAN, J., 2009. Review of *The House of Bernarda Alba* by Rona Munro. *Joyce McMillan blog*. [online] 18 September. [viewed 14 January 2011]. Available from: <http://joycemcmillan.wordpress.com/2009/09/18/the-house-of-bernarda-alba/>

MORGAN, E., 2002. Programme Notes to *Phaedra* in Hardwick, L. 'Classical Theatre in Modern Scotland – A Democratic Stage'. Open University, [online]. [viewed 3 July 2012]. Available from: <http://www2.open.ac.uk/ClassicalStudies/GreekPlays/Seminar02/LHFinal.htm>

PEEBLES, A., 2012. *Transcript*. Interview by M. Paraskevova. Edinburgh. 11 May.

RAMSDEN, T., 2002 Review of *Uncle Vanya* by T. Leonard Theatre Babel, Theatre Royal York. *The Edinburgh Guide*. [online]. 11 May. [viewed 30 April 2013]. Available from: [http://www.edinburghguide.com/aande/theatre/reviews/u/uncle\\_vanya\\_babel.shtml](http://www.edinburghguide.com/aande/theatre/reviews/u/uncle_vanya_babel.shtml).

REHM, R., 1992. *Greek Tragic Theatre*. London, NY: Routledge.

STEVENSON, R., 2004. Triumphant Tartuffification Liz Lochhead's Translation of Molière's *Tartuffe* In: FINDLAY, B., ed. *Frae Ither Tongues*. Multilingual Matters Ltd. pp. 106-122.

## Chapter Four

### Contemporary Cultural Identities and the Abjected Feminine in *Medea* and *Thebans*

Lochhead approaches the Greek tragedies with the idea of contemporisation and reflection on the local cultural identity with central emphasis on language and performance in mind. Following the presumption of the Greek classicists' view expressed by Edith Hall, that contemporary adaptations of *Medea* and *Antigone* are performed with the idea of exploration of post-colonial identities, the dramatist questions the new internationalist view as multicultural in *Medea* and hybrid in *Thebans* (Hall 2004).

As already discussed in Chapter Three, the playwright is a traditional adaptor in the sense that she follows the general trend of Scottish adaptations: domestication of the classical texts by frequently faithfully preserving the original story, characters, or plot but not the language. Accordingly, Lochhead again transposes the action to Scotland/Britain in both adaptations. Additionally, as a 'defiant writer' (Varty 1997), she refuses to conform to the tragic genre of characterisation, structure and language. Although the statements 'traditional' and 'defiant' sound contradictory, in the case of the dramatist's work they seem to co-operate well and turn into a source of comic energies. Moreover, Scottish theatre traditions are deeply rooted in the comic genre, so that the transposition of the adapted texts in the native comic tradition of theatre and performance, further reinforced with the choice of cast and acting styles by the artistic director of *theatre babel*, feeds into the definition for 'traditional adaptor' in the Scottish context.

The genre shift is achieved through the application of predominantly transgressive techniques by the playwright corresponding to feminine aesthetics, especially with the introduced ambiguity in female characterisation and disrupted chronology, tableau use, post-dramatic space, etc. The choice of techniques is dictated by the specific angle of interpretation of the cultural images by Lochhead, i.e. through a female point of view. As already discussed in Chapter One and Chapter Two, her female characters are socially framed and constructed and correspond to two

manifestations of the feminine in Kristeva's theory about Abjection. Both plays are studied with a focus on the mother figure and mother function with the idea of performed identities of femaleness and relate them to the post-colonial reading of the gendered national question in the understanding of Rezibaum outlined in Chapter One. Further to this, in the course of genre transgression the playwright resignifies the Greek concepts of *agon* and *fate* (humans are pawns in the hands of Gods) into agony and fate as established cultural practices and expected social roles as sources of cultural self-satire.

The post-colonial reading of national identity in Scotland is with focus on discussing the relationship between coloniser and colonised as a rhetoric of the private and public, in which the voice of Lochhead differs. Her approach as adaptor is idiosyncratic: she supports the gendered question discourse and although she explores culture with the help of the post-colonial female subject, i.e. she uses feminist techniques, she is not a feminist writer as already suggested in Chapter Two. For example, initially the character of Medea is a rhetorical construct of ancient Greek theatre. The character has been gradually demythologised and studied in time as a social construct. The feminist reading of the play primary concern is the gender identity question, or how women in mythology are represented. Jane de Gay in *Languages of Theatre Shaped by Women* includes Medea in the group of the 'demonised' women by the mythological ideology and argues that the most successful deconstruction practice is critical distancing from the text with the application of meta-techniques (de Gay & Goodman 2001, p. 14). Lochhead uses the suggested feminist reading of the play as a mythological text as a starting point but moves beyond it – she openly states in the foreword of the published play text that she failed to interpret Euripides as a misogynist (Lochhead 2000, p. 1).

Following the gendered question discourse in Scotland and the contemporary references in the text, the current chapter analyses the character of Medea as a contemporary reading of the woman question from the perspective of Kristeva's sexual difference and ethics. Kristeva defines femaleness in this context as exile – a third philosophical category between essentialism and constructivism, i.e. between



biological and social women. It also informs the discourse of the exile in the national question and studies the dominant new nationalist identity of contemporary Scottish society as open, inclusive and multicultural in theatre. Read with the idea of split identity and the need for an outsider's voice, frequently an exile who narrates the cultural images, the feminine/female narrator in the adaptations by Lochhead partially fulfills the role.

Apart from the female protagonist in *Medea*, Glauke and the Chorus are also included in the character analysis due to their significance for the action and development of the plot. Moreover, as already discussed in Chapter Two, the playwright's technique of introducing foil female characters is a general approach of deconstructing the current dominant feminist stereotypes and discourses.

The female characterisation, with a specific emphasis on language, is studied from the perspective of storytelling and narration as alienation tools employed by the writer. Her style of bringing twists to old tales is questioned with special attention to the endings of the plays, which in her previous adaptations have frequently been altered, e.g. *Tartuffe* (1985).

In *Thebans*, the playwright questions the new nationalist view of British/Scottish society as culturally hybrid. The narrative of a cursed family follows the story of the Theban royal family in the works of Sophocles' *The Theban Plays* (1947) and Euripides' *Phoenician Women* (2011). The contemporary version of the play offered by Lochhead and the first production team of *theatre babel* challenges the genre of the play in a similar fashion through an inexhaustible use of verbal irony and verbal play. It also offers a different reading of the Chorus from the original and alters the ending. Compared with Lochhead's first adaptation of Greek tragedy, *Medea*, which characterises with centrality of Scottish culture, *Thebans* is a more ambitious project. It reflects a broader image of the subject – post-colonial Scottish society as British and the aspect of internal colonisation and assumed equality between English and Scottish as part of the current national debate.

According to Peter Burian (1997), the first translations of Greek plays occurred in fifteenth-century Italy and among the most important names of translators is that of

the Scottish humanist John Buchanan, who provided the first Latin translation of *Medea*. In *Tragedy Adapted for Stages and Screens: the Renaissance to the Present*, Burian argues that from Latin translations of Greek tragedies, and the interpretation of Latin critics, the notion of tragedy was primarily to show the instability of human affairs through a reversal of fortune in the lives of the great (1997, p. 231). Mainly perceived as a rhetorical device, tragedy in the sixteenth-century had a more important role in the teaching of rhetoric and morality than in theatrical praxis (1997, p. 232). Part of that rhetoric consisted of praising women who have loved but lost, as expressed by Ovid through the metaphor ‘tigress of iron and stone’ (myths about women). Lochhead revisits this concept in a dialogue between the Chorus and Medea, with the meaning of a monster, a cold and insensitive mother projecting a supernatural biological presence. As previously suggested, the monster is a poetic device to express the recurrent image of the female voice in the playwright’s work.

Although the first translation of the play from the Greek was offered in the fifteenth-century, the first Scottish performance had to wait for almost five centuries. The reasons for the delay could be explained with the established tradition of translation into Scots of mainly comic texts as a form of cultural resistance. However, when *Medea* was finally performed in Scots, it preserved one of its most important features of Scottish theatre tradition, namely:

Classical drama into Scots translation continues to be used to explore the new identities being forged in contemporary Scotland. (Corbett 2006, p. 33)

Lochhead’s adaptation into Scots emerged as part of the *Greeks*<sup>xv</sup> project in 2000, which was commissioned by the Glasgow based *theatre babel*, the only Scottish theatre group working with classical plays for contemporary audiences at the time. The project was initiated by the newly restored Scottish Parliament after its devolution in 1999, and was aimed at contemporary reflection on Scottish society and culture. The partial autonomy of Scotland raised the beliefs that the country was a part of the post-colonial world. Moreover, the marginalised indigenous culture took back its central place. Lochhead’s *Medea* also acknowledged the cultural move and reaped most of the fame compared with the other two plays from the project. Apart

from touring within the UK, the play visited another twenty-two countries, among them India, Canada and the USA. Part of the theatre criticism included in the analysis of the performance of the plays comes from these parts of the world.

Lochhead's adaptation, similarly to previous practice of Scottish adaptors of Greek tragedies, resorts to playfulness with registers, i.e. her own version of stage Scots. She brings the language close to the contemporary audience by using comprehensible vocabulary and colloquialisms in order to express irony and sarcasm in the fashion of Dunlop's adaptation (1991-93). Brown's observations on the ability of Scots to introduce direct political debate in his adaptations of *Antigone* in 1969 and 1996 have been applied by Lochhead too. Lochhead's text transposes the political theme of the tragedy as the historical Scottish experience of the impact of family on hierarchy and social duty, not so much in accordance with Brown's belief, but as a deconstructed image of the fallen queen who, instead of waiting for beheading, seeks revenge. In the opinion of Reizbaum (2005), such action could be interpreted as a step towards exorcism, as already discussed in Chapter One and Chapter Three.

As Brown (2002), Findlay (2003) and Lenz(2009) claim, the direct application of political debate by Lochhead is achieved through the application of various Scots registers and the discourse of the private and the public. However, Lochhead attributes the classical political discourse of the private and the public to the male characters as their political voice in the play in order to establish the dominant cultural context. The only Scots-speaking female character, the Nurse, belongs to the class of the servants and is excluded from discourse as would also have been the case in the social context of fifth-century BC Athens. According to Edith Hall, non-Athenians, women, and slaves were excluded from the assembly and normally had to be represented by a citizen in the law courts (the polis) (1997, p. 92). Thus, these groups were silenced in the public discourse of the city. Paradoxically, the fictional representatives of these groups were permitted by the multivocal form of tragedy to address the public in the theatre as they never could in reality (Hall 1997, p. 93). Hall adds:

The tragedians often used communities other than Athens as sites for ethnic self-definition, the barbarian world often functions in the tragic imagination as the home of vices. Also, tragedy came to be set not in the male arenas of civic discourse – the council, assembly or law courts – but the marginal space immediately outside the door of the private home. (Hall 1997, p. 104)

The ethnic self-definition of the Greeks bears a resemblance to ethnic nationalism in Scotland and the projected culturally divided self in which women are traditionally dismissed and treated as the carriers of vices and irrationality. This gender/sex divide in the cultural self is utilised by Lochhead in order to establish the central debate in the play. In contrast, Margaret Williamson claims that the aim of the classical texts was not so much to assert the discourse about the relation between the sexes. Rather, the representations of larger-than-life women in Greek plays in the fifth-century BC assisted the construction of the idea of the private, and reflected upon the relation between the public and the private life (1990, p. 16). Such interests to define political identity via ritual theatre, in the opinion of Fischer-Lichte, had Aeschylus and Sophocles (2002, pp.18-21). In their plays, the political identity of the community took a central role. The protagonists were depicted as representatives of the dual identities of ‘self-earned, political’ self through deeds, and ‘the natural/physical by the gods and fate’ image (Fischer-Lichte 2002, p. 21). Euripides saw the polis/democratic identity as questionable, because, in his view, reason failed to fulfil the main communication between body and language. Thus reason is subordinate to the physis, its desires and passions and he would frequently use female protagonists to express this idea (Fischer-Lichte 2002, p. 25). The belief that reason does not lead to truth is preserved in the interpretation of *Medea* by Lochhead and explored in detail in *Thebans*. This questioning of the value of reason echoes in the Scottish philosophical teaching of rationality and the culture of moderation, which is presented as a constraint by the playwright in her interpretation of the Greek plays.

The main theme in *Medea* is expressed overtly by the protagonist who refers to her debate with Jason as ‘sex war’. The phrase is used by the Chorus who see themselves as ‘survivors of the sex war’, obviously an ironic statement by the playwright (*Medea*, p. 7). This shows that Lochhead is not interested in following the masculine political debate of the public and the private but prefers to use it as a background

against which to politicise the female subject, thus indirectly exploring the current Scottish cultural identity as exile. She also manages to question the inability to explore the current cultural image with the discourse of the private and public, as already mentioned in Chapter Three. This argument is also valid for the explorations of the national identity model in the second adaptation of the Greek plays – *Thebans*.

In terms of the depiction of female identity, or the insertion of the female post-colonial subject and female voice in the debate, it was suggested in Chapter Two that Lochhead's women resemble Joan Ure's characterisations most closely. Ure's approach (McDonald 2002, p. 7) presented women as the stronger sex by attributing better rationality to them, all stemming from her belief that both sexes were equal and suffered equally from the imposed social mythology about men and women. Lochhead's approach differs from Ure's so that, despite the same applied gender dichotomy of women as the more rational and stronger sex, she ironises and disapproves of the social inequality between the sexes. As a result, the character of Medea is human, passionate, strong and rational but brought to the extreme edge of the human where her image often takes the form of the monster due to her sexuality. In Corbett's view, the theme of women's monstrous sexuality, revisited by the playwright, speaks of 'unreconstructed patriarchal Calvinism and its concern with the monstrous regiment of women' (2006, pp. 28-29). The theme is part of the national mythological narratives about Mary Queen of Scots.

Lochhead's decision to replace the love theme in the original with sex and sexual relationships between men and women contributes to the gradual deconstruction of the established cultural images through the female subject in the adaptation expressed by the male characters. For instance, Kreon expresses a traditionalist, patriarchal view about Medea as the witch and the whore, and Jason supports the modern dismissive view of the female as 'brainless and chatterbox', which at the end turns into the monster figure. The Manservant sees Medea as the frightening 'bitch'. However, the Nurse, who also belongs to the Scottish cultural image, nurtures ambiguous feelings of love and fear towards her mistress with fear taking the dominant position in their relationship. The Chorus betrays/negates Medea after

witnessing her murder the young and innocent princess as an act of breaking sisterhood. The Chorus's role could also be interpreted from the perspective of the Kristevan split in the motherly or the borderline between nature and culture and of her own flesh, which contradicts the social norm of motherhood. Thus Lochhead attacks two of the established conventional feminist clichés: sisterhood between women (a recurring theme in her poetry described as 'clyping'), and the social image of women as natural mothers, opposing the patriarchal perception of women as the biologically reproductive source and thus keepers and breeders of cultural reproductivity. For that reason, Lochhead's Medea turns into the protesting voice against women's objectification by the dominant culture and shows how gender is constructed by social and cultural practices.

Medea is not only a married woman and mother but also a foreigner and a full of knowledge and determination, cunning woman who threatens the phallic/citizenship body. She is also an individualised female character, who is denied the right to defend herself in front of the law: neither Kreon, nor Jason finds her arguments worth listening to. After Medea's futile attempts to enter an argument by using the same language of hate the patriarchal class uses, she chooses female strategies to undermine the status quo. Medea is the punished/abjected colonised body before she has done any wrong – apart from her words of vengeance, and even this is not clear whether she uttered them with serious intention or out of rage and frustration. As a result, the act of murder of the infants comes as a counter act to the injustice she suffered twice – firstly from Jason (here Lochhead subtly introduces the theme of female colonisation and exploitation which she further develops in *Educating Agnes* and *Miseryguts*), and secondly from Kreon who orders her banishment and exile. Thus Lochhead depicts women in Scotland as the traditional victims of double oppression, already discussed in Chapter One – both for their gender (Jason) and their cultural identity (Kreon).

The gendered question of national identity in Scotland has always included the theme of cultural betrayal, which Lochhead also revisits with her interpretation of sex difference in the cultural image. This cultural construct represented as a major sex

betrayal and a series of small betrayals inflicted upon the protagonists, read through Kristeva's theory about femininity, marks the psychological moments of negation. The further constructive elements of the process of abjection are introduced linguistically through the use of hate speech and dramaturgically through the scene alterations of the ending, necessary to demythologise the character. Some of the reviewers consider the replacement of Aegeus' scene with Glauke's dissatisfactory and desultory, as the emphasis is shifted away from the witch image and the witch's holistic knowledge to the question of womanhood and motherhood. According to the preface to the original play by Euripides:

Her situation is viewed from several perspectives as an ordinary woman, suffering from the same disadvantages as everyday Athenian wives; as a stranger in a foreign land; as a cunning woman, one of exceptional quickness and intelligence; as a barbarian witch, skilled in potions; and as an avenging demon figure. (2000, p. 46)

Lochhead replaces the barbarian witch and the avenging demon figure with equally powerful perspectives, and succeeds to bring more complexity to the characters than the original. For example, the seclusion of women like Glauke is given voice on stage but only in the company of other women.

The Chorus, as the collective unconscious and the *unheimlich*, disrupts the established dominant (patriarchal) narrative by existing in a different temporal dimension (chora). Therefore, they can only address Medea and the audience, but are non-existent to the rest of the characters in the play.

Another interpretation of the Chorus can be found in the early work of Lochhead, which offers a broad and complex picture of the psyche of women: a wide range of female images from different classes and educations and voices nurtured by the Scottish balladic and oral traditions. Medea's Chorus could be viewed as a dramatic impersonation of all those voices, because most of the poetic language and imagery comes from the Chorus' speeches and the Nurse.

Additionally, Lochhead claims that she likes the storytelling aspect of drama and during characterisation she generally moves from satire to sympathy (Clune 1993, p.

87). The same character-constructing techniques are preserved by Lochhead and often result in ambiguity of the characters, triggering both sympathy and laughter from the audience. In the tragedies, those are transposed self-referentially to the levels of fear and sympathy experienced by the rest of the female characters in *Medea* and both male and female characters in *Thebans*. Moreover, in the foreword to the published script, Lochhead describes Medea as a woman driven by her female desperation which makes her a sympathetic character (2000, p.vi). This is similar to the self-description Jocasta makes in *Thebans* (p. 35, 'Thebans in my desperation I have brokered/what I hope will be a truce') only the motivation behind the actions of Jocasta is more humane and peaceful. Medea is driven by a desire for revenge but at the heart of their positions as mothers, both Medea and Jocasta strive to preserve their families and the central theme of both plays is agony.

Lochhead's division of the male world from the female serves to bring into focus the woman question in the established Scottish masculine society in which female sexuality is reduced to the totemic image of the unknown, threatening female-monster, sphinx, which most of the time speaks in riddles. Kristeva sees the symbolic order as temporal, which asserts itself through masculine values and the entrance to the temporal scene of socio-politics for women is granted against the acceptance of certain ethics: the masculine morals and values and, regardless of the act – serving or overthrowing the socio-economic order, always performing the role of supermen (Kristeva 1981, p. 14). McClure builds on this the idea of women in Greek plays as titans, larger-than-life characters (McClure 1999). These larger-than-life characters have been ironically interpreted by Lochhead as the monstrous, uncanny, in the cultural self. For instance, the Chorus image in *Medea* is also part of the uncanny, but it is the familiar part of the *unheimlich*, which is further developed into the androgynous character of Tiresias in *Thebans*.

Tragedy as a political discourse 'also reinforced the ideology of silence and seclusion of women', which in drama were depicted, particularly wives, as masterful and persuasive speakers whose words get the better of men (McClure 1999, p. 24). In Lochhead's version this political discourse is only one of the discourses about the



protagonist outwardly spoken by Kreon and supported by the Manservant and the Nurse all of whom are class members of the Scottish society. Kristeva claims that the question of sexual difference is fore-grounded in the Christian monotheism Western culture: Adam represses his desire to transgress (Kristeva 1981, p. 15). The Christian doctrine has imposed two feminine archetypes which are closely related to the mother image as a source of fear: the ecstatic and the melancholic (Kristeva 1981, pp. 27-28). In the former, the mother is denied and her attributes are displaced onto the symbolic father leading to the submission of woman to a sexually undifferentiated androgynous being (The Catholic Virgin Mary). The latter experiences submission to the father as punishment, pain and suffering, inflicted upon the heterogeneous body (the Protestant view) (Kristeva, pp. 27-28).

Furthermore, Lochhead's version offers a second level of silence and seclusion based on the function of the Chorus as a keeper of the social morals and a mirror for Medea as the cultural outsider. Corbett defines it as the issue of ethnicity brought out in Scots translation for the first time where traditionally the image of 'the Other' was occupied by the English (Corbett 2006, p. 32). Jackson & Scott share the opinion that the existence of inserted difference speaks of inequality and representation, and the act of looking leads to objectification of the subjects/objects that are looked at – the ones who decide what the meaning/representation is going to be are the ones who have the power. In systems of slavery and colonialism this existent inequality could also apply to 'the maternal appropriation of human bodies', thus 'colonised women have been subjected to specific forms of subjugation in which sexual and racial oppression intersect in complex way' (Jackson & Scott 1996, p. 22).

The exploration of the connection between the image of women and foreigners in Lochhead's *Medea* is not only a feminist interpretation in which gender is linked to race, but also an insight into the Scottish cultural identity traditionally perceived as 'the Other/foreign self'. The reading of gender as race is a post-colonial dramatic technique which, according to Helen Gilbert and Joanne Tompkins, serves as a visual marker for body politics (Gilbert & Tompkins 2002, p. 205). In other words, the voicing of silence paradigm in earlier works by Lochhead is developed into vocalised

visibility of the female physical body (in previous works there were dancers on stage as a dramatic means for visualisation of the body) and its abjection by the dominant male culture. Kristeva's theoretical framework also asserts the idea of male and female cultural difference and depicts women as members of another race.

*Medea* is not only a contemporary reading of gender difference in the post-colonial world, but, read locally, it is also the narrated image of the psychologically displaced Scot by the dominant, again Scottish culture. It has been narrated through the socially marginalised female character of Medea whose slave-like (socially lower) status is problematised through the exploration of her sexuality.

The modern interpretation of the Medea play by Lochhead could be read as an effort to break the cycle of the 'triumph of failure' previously discussed in Chapter One. According to Reizbaum, such a trope reads the national image as 'imported foreignness inside' – the source of all conflicts are born inside the Scottish society (Reizbaum 2005, p. 190). Lochhead perhaps suggests that there is a false dichotomy between the political and the private/sexual, which is 'arguable about the original but sometimes obscured by the submergence of the sexual in favour of the gendered' (Reizbaum 2005, p. 197). The celebrated decapitation of the Scottish queen is an imposed social construct of extreme seclusion, or abjection, which interpreted in the context of post-colonialism leads to the silencing of individual and communal identity politics (Lehner 2012, p. 293). The moment of punishment by the law of the father is not offered in the adaptation by Lochhead, which leaves a disconcerting feeling in the audience.

The conflict of 'imported foreignness' is introduced by the playwright as 'imported voice' and abjected female body which brings body politics into the centre of discussion. Even though Medea speaks like the locals, she is not one of them and the murder of the children appears as a direct attack on the biological concept of woman. Medea's sexuality is inscribed on the maternal body which in Kristeva's study of abjection in *Desire in Language* (1980) is:

... the place of a splitting, which [...] nevertheless remains a constant factor of social reality. Through a body, destined to ensure reproduction of the species, the woman-subject, although under the sway of paternal function (as

symbolising, speaking subject), more of a *filter* than anyone else, is a threshold where 'nature' confronts 'culture'. (p. 238)

The place of splitting in the narrative is similar to the *MQS* play where the relationship of women and power is represented through the mirror image of both queens. Mary, the foreigner, is gradually disempowered politically and biologically as a lover and mother and her child is taken away from her. Elizabeth, her cousin, is also disempowered biologically as a childless ruler, who is politically also foreign to the Scottish cultural scene. The image of the childless mother, either separated from her children or not given birth to any, narrates an individualised female identity which is often interpreted as a threat by the phallic culture.

In *Medea*, Glauke is such a mirror image. Glauke is the woman in power and serves as 'expectation of sovereignty and accession of the sexual but also the figure of betrayal' (Reizbaum 2005, p. 99). Further poetic origins of the image could be found in Lochhead's poem 'The Other Woman' in which the other woman is nameless and described as a bolster between two lovers (Lochhead 2003):

The other woman  
Lies  
The other side of my very own mirror  
Sweet, when I smile  
Straight out for you, she  
Puts a little twist on it, my  
Right hand never knows what her left is doing... (p 106)

Kristeva's interest in interpreting the symbolic aspects of motherhood becomes politicised: a warning of the dangers of 'becoming either militant or victim' if motherhood in its symbolic form is rejected – the theme occupies a central place in Lochhead's *Medea* (Aintley 1990, p. 55).

In *Revolution in Poetic Language*, Kristeva speaks of a practice of dissent as the frontier at which ethics develop (1984, p. 55). Its importance she views as 'a constant transgression and renewal of the subject's positioning with regard to the process of signification which *reinserts* such a subject into the transformation of community and discourse' (1984, p. 55). The transgressive force of the subject is what Kristeva defines as the feminine (semiotic), which takes the position of the social 'Other' and

is attributed by Lochhead to the Other self in the split cultural identity model of the Scottish since the 1990s.

This is how the playwright approached the tragedy in her own words:

I didn't know if I could find a way into 'Medea', so I just decided to look at it as a story. When I did this, I found it fascinating. It's not a tragedy, in any strict generic sense. Great plays defy all that – you're dealing here with the very basis of the soul, which can't be classified. It's pure story. The play is not about doing the deeds, it's the argument about whether or not we should do them. The audience, the Chorus, the gods, and consciences of the people speaking all become part of the same thing – each participant defends the right to do what they're doing, so they're like courtroom dramas. (Open University 2000)

The playwright's interpretation of the text as a story, not a tragic one, as Euripides himself defines and Aristotle critiques it, deserves to be analysed from the perspective of narration with an expected twist at the end as her previous dramatic and poetic works suggest, i.e. re-signification of meanings. Lochhead places the political dimension of the play in the psychological space of courtroom dramas, i.e. she turns the story into a narrative familiar to the Scottish audience: a crime story and its legal debate. The source of dramatic tension for the playwright is stored in:

... the ambivalent relationship between the Chorus, which at the time of Euripides consists of women, who are equally frightened by Medea (not only the men in the play), but they are also the ones who have sympathy for her. (Open University 2000)

The quote suggests Kristeva's driving force of fear as foundational for the act of abjection, which Lochhead applies in her characterisation of the tragic cast with the difference that to the female characters she attributes feelings of sympathy too. In the further characterisation of women in the play, the Nurse and Glauke appear with the same attitude towards the foreign and cunning protagonist. In the traditional tragedy theory of Aristotle, the governing emotions in the play are fear and pity. Lochhead replaces this with fear of the uncanny (in the Kristevan reading of femininity by the phallic culture) and undermines it with rich irony. The female cast is split between the two opposing emotions of fear and sympathy because of performing as dual bearers of the rational and irrational in the human psyche. Thus the fashioning of

Lochhead's poetic female characterisation results in clashing experiences of satire and sympathy.

The cultural scene is set as masculine. Lochhead's male cast is squeezed to three: Kreon, Jason and the Manservant, who is a fused image of the tutor and the messenger in the original Euripidean text. They (together with the Nurse) serve to establish the hierarchy of power and the category of class in the Scottish context, which is also linguistically marked through the application of registers of Scots and English. In the first stage directions, the playwright sets the action in Scotland in which 'language varies from Scots to Scots-English – from time to time and from character to character – and particular emotional state of character' (*Medea*, p. 3). The more passionate the character voice becomes, the more Scots is chosen as the language medium, thus setting the Scottish as feminine (outsider's view).

Kreon's voice is strongly Scots and his power is shown with the appearance of a modest personal retinue (*Medea*, p. 11); Jason speaks English and is introduced as 'Greek – but not from this place' (*Medea*, p. 16). The allusion Lochhead makes about English (seen as the Greek) as the language of civilisation and power, the fact that Kreon accepts in his family Jason as his son and future king of the place, and Glauke firmly believing she is a member of the culture of the Greeks, all create a subtle introduction to the colonisation of Scotland by the English.

The Nurse and the Manservant are Scots speakers and, as representatives of the lower (working) class in Scottish society, they reveal a variety of registers: for instance, they shift to Scots-English to speak to their mistress, Medea (*Medea*, p. 5). The social position of the protagonist is similarly low at the opening of the play. The first thing the audience encounters is the voice of Medea, which is described as 'not Scots but a foreigner speaking good English – an 'incomer voice' (*Medea*, p. 6). Later on, Medea appears on the stage as 'not a girl – but dignified, beautiful, calm and utterly reasonable. Somewhat exotic' (*Medea*, p. 9). The playwright intentionally preserves the exoticism of 'the Other' and inserts it as a post-colonial subject. Further, at the first encounter of Medea with the Chorus, she ironically describes

herself as the different, barbarian Other to the female Chorus, introduced as ‘women of all times, all ages, classes and professions’ (*Medea*, p. 7). The ‘Greek’ identity of the Chorus is defined through their language and hypocritical attitude as a group of English speakers (*Medea*, p. 9).

The description of Medea in the opening scene by the Nurse is both full of horror and sympathy: ‘I am feart for her/ fear her’ (*Medea*, p. 4). She tells Medea’s story with a great pain in her heart. Similarly to Ovid’s version in the *Metamorphoses*, Medea is represented as the victim of her love for Jason. For her sacrifices of all dear to her – homeland, family and children she has been paid with betrayals! This point is further intensified with the repetition of ‘for his sake’ three times in the opening speech of the Nurse. The Nurse also acts like a fortune-teller, predicting in a nightmarish vision what will happen to Jason, Kreon and his daughter and, knowing well Medea and her rage, ends up with: ‘she’s capable of onything’ (*Medea*, p. 4). In the same hellish story, the hatred in Medea and her lust for revenge is described metaphorically: ‘I shut my eyes and see Medea/ creepan through the labyrinthine palace/ follying her hatred like a thread’ (*Medea*, p. 4), alluding to the myth about Ariadne and her unhappy love story with Theseus in the palace of King Minos. But the image is reversed – while Ariadne helps Theseus to solve the Minotaur problem and get out of the palace unscathed out of love, Medea goes back to the palace following her own thread of hatred to seek revenge. This mention of the ‘labyrinth’ is also the gate through which the contemporary story revisits the mythical and the image of the woman and the monster (the Minotaur) merge. For Lochhead, the Minotaur is the symbolic of the monstrous product of illicit and unnatural love (Boyd 1993, p. 39).

S.J. Boyd interprets the monster image in Lochhead’s work as an image which appeared for the first time in the poem ‘Revelation’ in her first collection *Memo for Spring* (1972):

This poem describes a rite-of-passage encounter with a ‘monster’ bull... being the first articulation of a voice that speaks through much of Lochhead’s work in both verse and drama. ... The writing of a poem begins with a kind of bemonstering of the language (1993, pp. 38–39)

The central topic of the poem is body politics and language, which in itself is ritualistic and supports Fischer-Lichte's idea about the role of European drama and theatre as a rite of passages to create liminal spaces (2002, pp. 1–2).

This topic ironically reveals that what is of the home turns out to contain the weird, the monstrous which belongs to the Freudian world of the uncanny: 'the uncanny is this class of the frightening which leads back to what is known of old and long familiar' (Boyd 1993, p. 40). The merging of the uncanny with the monster female image is also one of the wrong interpretations of femininity explored by Lochhead and interpreted as the still dominant mythology in the national question, which Reizbaum views as a problematic replacement of gender with sex.

The Nurse's opening speech is full of poetic imagery, which is not accidental considering the fact that the theme of love in the original has been replaced with the poetic image of the monster, as discussed above. Lochhead applies a set of poetic devices such as synecdoche and juxtaposition of the royal bed to Medea's one in order to bring the contrast in the social statuses of both queens:

NURSE: this house is a ruin ashes  
A cold hearth and the fire put out in it  
For ever  
He's lording it lolling in bed with his royal bit  
She lies in cold ashes inconsolable. (*Medea*, p. 7)

The 'cold hearth' is a synecdoche reference to the ruined marriage and home of Medea, which the poet metaphorically expands with the image of the inconsolable body of her mistress left lying in its cold ashes. The coldness of the former lovers' bed is contrasted to the victorious and amorous tossing of the male body in the royal bed, described as 'lording and lolling' by Lochhead in order to imply colonial male presence and subordinate social image of women. The servant's description of the story is told from a female point of view as the tragic story between two lovers (implied by the use of the singular third person pronouns 'she' and 'he') and the emergence of the other woman. In the original, the Nurse tells the story from a subordinate position, in contrast, referring to the main characters in the story respectfully as 'the mistress and the master of the house':

NURSE: there is not house; all is now ended. Its master is  
The captive of a princess' bed, while the mistress pines her life  
Away in her bedchamber, refusing to let a single friend bring any comfort to  
her heart. (Euripides, p. 54)

Furthermore, there are no traces of such physical/body presence and juxtapositions of beds but a bed to a bedchamber (decorous and state matching) in which Medea fights pain and rage. The original character of Medea is not depicted in subordinate terms although the house is still used metaphorically to speak of the end of a marriage, and Jason is not the victor but the victim of the charms of another woman in this story: 'the captive of a princess' bed'. The dual position of victimisation of both lovers in the original text depicts tragic characters who are pawns of fate with the idea of provoking pity in the spectators. Lochhead's interpretation is more 'fateless' in the sense that the characters are more conscious of their actions and more responsible but fail to go beyond the performance of the social roles prescribed by the cultural norms in which the inhuman image of the Monster, with which Medea is identified, transgresses the main narrative. This image is initially presented by the Nurse, who uses strong metaphors which conjure up very powerful and vivid images of fear of something inhuman, Minotaur-like: 'claws at me bull glares/would gore me gash me'(Medea, p. 8). Along with this, the Nurse reveals the emotion of a deep, bottomless human despair, which invokes sympathy 'she nurses her rage/ like a lioness suckling her last living cub' and 'I'm anathema/that blank stare' (Medea, p. 8). The original translation contains mostly adjectives like 'and yet that fierce look she throws at any servant' in order to protect her children like 'a lioness/with cubs'(Euripides, p. 55), and presents Medea mostly as a caring mother rather than anything of the monster figure Lochhead brings into the narrative.

In the opening scene in the original, the Chorus enters into lyrical repartee with the Nurse which is interrupted by the sudden outbursts of Medea. In Lochhead's interpretation, the Chorus speaks only to Medea and stays invisible to the rest of the characters – a structure which resembles that used in *MQS*, namely, the poetic figure/ambiguous narrator and Chorus La Corbie and of her function in the story of Mary. Along with the ambiguous narrator's voice, the Chorus displays androgyny similarly to its predecessor La Corbie, although this is not evident in the text but



rather in the performance. On the stage the Chorus is both male and female and with doll-like makeup, which is a recurrent image used by Lochhead to show women's identity framed by the male gaze. Moreover:

Lochhead's expression of female androgyny and its compromises there became focused as a way of understanding the Scots' sense of national identity... The show critically well received, was an attack on the isolating nostalgic waves of Scottish nationhood... (Varty 1993, pp. 164)

The theme is explored further by the playwright in *Thebans*, where the seer, Tiresias, the poetic and historical voice, again in performance, appears as half-woman/half-man, and serves as a mirror to the Chorus. The Chorus in this version stands for the oppressed community, performed with the help of another favourite dramatic technique of Lochhead used in *Shanghaied*, *Same Difference* and *MQS*, namely, adults who perform as children, in order to reflect upon Scottish cultural images and their strong link with the psychological figure of the Mother (state of androgyny).

In her first encounter with Kreon, Medea plays the role of the meek woman who is ready to perform a motherly sacrifice and as a 'poor and honest widow' to be completely silenced and abjected as a slave by the king (*Medea*, p. 12). Euripides subverts the established social role of the mother through the ironic use of the mythologised image of the sorceress (McClure 1999, p. 65). Lochhead subverts the social and the biological role of the mother through the ironic representation of the abjection of the post-colonial subject, thus pushing the genre of the play from tragic-comedy into dark comedy. Hence, Medea describes herself as 'oppressed by my reputation/ the evil one the witch the clever woman', which is a 'fie... abomination' (*Medea*, p. 12).

Jason sees Medea as a cunning woman and a passion puppet (*Medea*, p. 19). For Glauke, she is a victim of the past: 'you live inside you own self only/ you live in the past' (*Medea*, p. 25). Glauke's position is that regardless of what happened they must 'for the sake of the children if for no one else/ make the best of things' (*Medea*, p. 26).

Apart from the character of Medea, the traditional role of the Chorus in the tragedy has been displaced by Euripides. In the Aristotelian view, the Chorus should participate in the action. The Chorus in *Medea*, though, finds itself in a famous difficulty at the murder of the children; it ought to participate in the action and may not. Kitto notes that in his later tragedies, Euripides made the Chorus a body of Ideal Spectators (Kitto 1961, p. 193).

In Euripides, the female Chorus supports the subversion of the social role of the mother, or as McClure clarifies it:

The Greek imagination also closely linked the persuasive power attributed to women in erotic contexts to magic; throughout the literary tradition, women procure and employ drugs, chant incantations, and perform magical acts intended to gain control over men. (McClure 1999, p. 65)

In Lochhead, the female Chorus is challenged with the biological role of the mother. In their lament, they give the following description of Medea, referring to the unnatural monster-like behaviour of the protagonist:

you're stone you're iron  
your heart is nothing human  
sex makes birth makes death  
but here is a broken circle  
here is nothing natural (*Medea*, p. 44)

which speaks of not only undermined social/racial but also biological/ ethnical identity, i.e. a broken birth-death cycle or disturbed logic of sexual, hence cultural, re-productivity. Lochhead makes Medea a mother of three children: two boys and a girl, so that the murder of the children is not directly an attack on the social, patriarchal reproductive function of the mother, i.e. giving birth to sons solely. Further to this, Lochhead expands the monstrous in the character of Medea by adding an additional murder and a child: Glauke (still a child herself) is pregnant in Lochhead's version, which leads to the betrayal on the side of the Chorus. The Chorus are very supportive at the beginning: 'punish him for us Medea' (*Medea*, p. 10), but later pity Glauke: 'he well deserved to truly/ poor silly bairn the bride/... hell' (*Medea*, p. 43). In the view of Reizbaum this can be interpreted as a break of the circle of constant triumph of the punishment of the national female body as a metaphor of Scottish identity. However, the Chorus and Glauke are also aspects of

the same complex interpretation of the female trope, which serves as a questionable image of exorcism. It seems that Lochhead attempts to undermine a specific dominant cultural perception of women narrated through the internalised self-images of the Chorus which reflect an old philosophy of moderation. For instance, in the debate with the Chorus, Medea mentions the name of the goddess Hecate as a metaphorical link to the chthonic, totemic image of women whose motherly sacrifices have been often praised as 'the tigress with heart of iron and stone' (viz. Ovid).

Lochhead's Medea breaks not only the natural circle of birth and death but defies the biological instinct of the mother as attributive (the maternal), which subverts the mythological image of Medea as a sorceress and the ritualistic perception of women's sexuality as totemic (the identification of the national with the female body of the land in the Scottish cultural rhetoric). Elizabeth Grozs points at the significance of the maternal and maternity in Kristeva's work for understanding sexual difference and gives the following definition of maternity:

[it] thus is not the function of a *woman* (this is also Kristeva's position regarding femininity): it is an organic, a social, pre-signifying space-time; it is disembodied... (Grozs 1995, p. 97)

If for Lacan the 'Woman' is man's projection of his own perfection through his fantasy of 'The Woman' (Arnolphe's character is well imprinted here), Kristeva is radical:

Women cannot *be*: the category woman is even that which does not fit into *being*. From there, women's practice can only be negative, in opposition to what exists... Certain feminist arguments seem to resuscitate a naïve romanticism, believing in an identity. (Grozs 1995, p. 97)

Certainly, the idea of lack of woman's identity is politically problematic. In Lochhead, Jason as a carrier of the symbolic negates the rationality of Medea's argument during their first encounter:

JASON: ... you did it/ in the first flush of lust for me let's face it...  
What's eating you's the sex thing it's not  
That I've gone off you and fancy fresh young flesh to fuck (*Medea*, p. 19)

Lochhead's replacement of the theme of love with sex (in the original 'The thought/ that torments you – and had fallen hopelessly in love with/New bride... (Euripides p. 65)), gives the symbolic interpretation of the female identity as the weak one, irrational due to uncontrollable passion and sexual desire. In the original text the drive is jealousy, in Lochhead, it is women's sexuality which is seen as problematic ('you did it/ in the first flush of lust for me') and Medea's behaviour is perceived as projected sexual desire towards Jason ('what's eating you's the sex thing...'). The act against Jason is interpreted as an act against Glauke – the young body, 'flesh to fuck' – as a negativity on the part of the semiotic in order to undermine the phallic self. Read through the lens of cultural identity debate in Scotland, the phallic body is represents the coloniser who is defined solely by his incessant sexual exploitation of the female body and stopped with an attack/negativity on the motherly, defined as the function of the feminine by the male gaze.

In *Kristeva and the Political*, Cecilia Sjoeholm (2005, p. 18) argues that the chora in Kristeva's theory does not represent society but transforms it, because the symbolic establishes identity through negation and 'the semiotic works through negativity to undermine and traverse the self' (2005, p. 43).

The so introduced discourse reaches its culmination in the new scene inserted by Lochhead as a replacement for the Aegeus scene in Euripides. The Aegeus scene helps Medea take the steps towards her monstrous plan after being assured a safe escape to Athens. What motivates Lochhead's Medea to act is not solely the meeting with Glauke, although it is further reinforced by it. The conversation with the Chorus preceding the meeting of the two women is of central importance. It becomes obvious that Medea is not only the voice of all women but also the hand of fate that will cease/break the circle of the constant mode of female victimisation, expressed by the Chorus in the philosophy of silent and passive acceptance of male infidelity as fate:

can I convince myself to  
play the part of one of you until I learn it?  
...  
can I wear the mask of moderation? (*Medea*, p. 23)

In the first two lines, Lochhead refers to the accepted and negotiated social masks of subordination which women wear in order to enter the male narrated cultural space. It is also conscious performative role 'play the part' but Lochhead adds 'of one of you until I learn it', which defines Medea as that individualised subject who holds the potential power of subverting the gender roles and disturbing the phallic rule, or is the ultimate melancholic body in the theory of Kristeva. The last quoted line is a direct reference to the dominant cultural identity of women as wearing the mask of moderation, i.e. performing rational (emotionally restrained) and subordinate social roles.

The meeting with Glauke provides further space for discussion about the social position of women. Glauke's argument confirms the mask of moderation she has already adopted from the social environment she has been raised in. And instead of succeeding in bringing more peace and agreement into their argument, Glauke puts more oil in the fire by her advice that Medea should accept her fate 'for Jason's sake' (*Medea*, p. 26). Although this meeting is not the sole motivation for Medea's plan of vengeance, what Glauke brings as news, of bearing Jason's child, certainly instigates further rage and pain, which contributes to the infanticide finale in the story.

The further expansion of the plot by Lochhead with the addition of a daughter and a pregnant Glauke, definitely adds to the monstrous image and the woman's cunning nature the dramatist wanted to present. It is not an image of reconciliation, and the young woman's presence serves as yet another betrayal on the part of the female members of the society, along with the Chorus who try to defend the youth with inexperience. Medea's act of disobedience in Lochhead's revision corresponds to Gilbert & Tompkins's definition of the best achievement of women post-colonial writers, namely to refuse to 'endorse the traditional signifiers of gender, particularly those linked to reproduction and mothering' (2002, p. 220).

The split female identity image in the face of Glauke and the Chorus versus Medea problematises the post-colonial discourse in the specific cultural context. Transferred to the level of the national debate and the dominant linguistic medium of hate speech,

with focus on the dispute between Jason and Medea, it narrates a more contemporary discourse which tresspasses the conventional post-colonial and enters the socio-linguistic discourse about the political nature of language described by Robin Lakoff as 'language war' (2000, p. 117).

The strength and determination of the protagonist is further revealed as a contrast to the weak passionate and foolish behaviour of the male characters even in the face of the Manservant, who after hearing the horrible news appears more upset in Lochhead's version:

MANSERVANT: run run you bitch of hell....  
... your poisons bitch

MEDEA (ironically): I never heard you speak a finer word...

MANSERVANT (in utter horror): you're mad you really did it  
By the Gods you are gled you did it!

MEDEA: calm down catch your breath my man.... (*Medea*, pp. 39-40)

In Euripides, the Messenger is more level-headed and his only reaction is 'What are you saying? Are you thinking straight,/My lady? Are you sane? ... (p. 79).

By attributing to Medea a stronger and more ambivalent character, Lochhead subverts the genders, similarly to the approach of Ure. However, this also makes the protagonist's motivation for the murder implausible. Colin Donati from the *Edinburgh Review* finds the ending 'both conclusive and utterly dissatisfying...all remain horrified by Medea's final action but stay passive' (Donati 2000). *The British Theatre Guide* finds a fundamental flaw in Lochhead's versions – the implausibility to Medea's decision to kill her children is seen partly as a consequence of the fact that the production is not firmly rooted in the ritual and traditions of Greek theatre (2000).

During the unfolding of the dramatic action, Lochhead offers a number of endings, implicitly hidden in the different tales about Medea told by the various participants in the myth. For instance, the Nurse's vision tells a story in which the vengeance of her

mistress ends up, similar to a classical Spanish tragedy, with the murder of both lovers and the king. Kreon sees himself as non-barbarian and non-tyrant and the act of granting Medea and her children a day is proof (in his eyes) of a merciful and civilised act. For the Chorus, he is 'a man with his own agenda' (*Medea*, p. 11), who reveals full authority – in the words of Kreon himself: 'I make the laws and execute them' (*Medea*, p. 11). For him, as it is revealed in the next lines, a day is not enough for any magical tricks to take place, thus this is the end which Kreon foresees. Jason, on the other hand, after learning about the death of Glauke and Kreon, rushes back to his house. And his words follow the Senecan end of the story:

... no hiding place  
no hole in the earth nowhere she can escape  
the royal vengeance that hunts her down  
I'm here to get my children before someone  
kills them for their mother's crime! (*Medea*, p. 44)

Earlier, in the main dispute scene with Medea, Jason's words echo truly the Euripidean version of the Cyprian role: 'Aphrodite ought to get the credit/ I was her darling you were her mere instrument/ a cunning woman/ passion's puppet' (*Medea*, p. 19)

In the final scene between Medea and Jason, we encounter more of the poetic and political debate and the distinct function of the symbolic and semiotic in the process of identification suggested by Kristeva. The phallic inserts the father of the law as justice justified by the principle of lawful/social revenge 'blood for blood' (Jason), which the semiotic traverses with the biological revenge of 'flesh of my flesh' (Medea) (*Medea*, p. 45). The murder of the children by Medea is an act of freedom from the father and social bondage to which she says 'end of story' twice in order to confirm that the phallic will continue to experience these semiotic disturbances without end (*Medea*, p. 46). It is also a political speech act of subverting power and willingly situating herself outside the parameters of linguistic control.

The ending of the play is very different from the original and deserves special attention. The stage directions reveal the following narrative design applied by Lochhead: '*this NURSE'S speech is the forefront of a trio*' in which Jason and the

Chorus' viewpoints are narrated and could be interpreted as the established symbolic language in the play (*Medea*, p. 46). Medea's story disrupts the traditional narratives in the same manner in which the semiotic chora in Kristeva's theory about poetic language works. The circular structure, implying a never-ending cycle, is dark, comical and apocalyptic, and serves as a verbal representation of abjection along with the cacophonic mixture of non-sense sounds, images and body movements, included in the end of the play where the three main stories of the Nurse, Jason and the Chorus ironically mingle. Such an ending could also be viewed as a culturally marked and inscribed performative body.

As a member of the group of 'The writers of the magnetic North', together with Edwin Morgan and Tom Leonard, Lochhead applies certain key themes (viewed as common features of Scottish literature) such as: *the matter of voice* and the hierarchies of power encoded in these systems of sound, articulation and approach; the notion that language is only partly natural, therefore *language* could be understood metaphorically in the sense of *media* – any form of communication from words to pigments, musical tones in the air, moving images, cartoons, etc; and the sense of darkly sustaining *humour* (Riach 2005, pp. 239–241).

In the final, silent tableau Jason, Medea, the Nurse, and the Menservant stand in individual spots as the rest of the stage fades into darkness. Such practices are transgressive to the classical dramatic form and put a stronger emphasis on performance. They are defined as feminine aesthetics by Sue-Ellen Case with the purpose of showing how the field of performance might become a site of resistance (Gale & Deeney 2012, p. 514). The dramaturgical manipulation of chronology is seminal in reframing the natural inferiority of women as socially constructed. Furthermore, Gilbert & Tompkins claim that these techniques help to dismantle the narrative and its underlying structures of 'authority and legitimisation'; to reorganise the relation between basic content and the form of representation which often includes reframing, refusal of closure, etc. (2002, p. 144).



Barbara Freedman claims that ‘theatrical narratives appear to promote the very ideology of difference they expose as arbitrary’ (Freedman 1990, p. 60). Lochhead, however, offers a more controlled gaze exposing both the limits of language and image (poetry and cinema) and that of the body of performance. This allows for classifying Lochhead’s plays as post-dramatic in which the carrier of *agon* has been replaced by the body as carrier of agony (the colonised body) thus preventing representation (Gale & Deeney 2012, pp. 804–805). Apart from affecting dramatic time, Lochhead also reframes the dramatic space with, for instance, the use of tableau at the end of the play, which according to Gale & Deeney deliberately closes the stage space off from the theatron (2012, p. 795).

The performance aspect of the play is part of the adaptation process as already discussed in Chapter Three. The play was performed for the first time on 17 March 2000 at the Tramway in Glasgow. Then, after a performance at the 2001 Fringe, the play toured nationally and internationally in 2002 to Manchester, Cyprus, India, and Toronto with the support of the British Council.

The artistic director Graham McLaren shares in an interview the reasons behind choosing Liz Lochhead as the adaptor of *Medea*:

If I really wanted someone to articulate the tempestuous nature between men and women it would be Liz. She lives there. She is full of contradictions and conflictions and she’s brilliant. (McLaren 2010)

Charles Spencer, a reviewer for the *Telegraph*, finds the new version powerfully poetic and witty, and which can compete with its source. In the reviewer’s view, the play is distinctively Scottish for the twenty-first century. John Coulbourn for *the Jam Canoe – Canada* admires Lochhead’s taste for contemporary dialogue but feels that it does not ‘always ring true to the setting or the story’. Part of the inadequacy comes with the pseudo-eighteenth and nineteenth-century costumes of the cast, devoid of any cultural references to Greek culture, in contrast to the set. Llewelyn Jones adds that the audience was never allowed to feel as though they were watching a ‘period piece’ (*Open University Receptions* 2000). The predominance of black in the costumes and in the set brought a sense of mourning to the production: the characters were dressed for a wedding, but in fastidious black. Even Glauke’s wedding dress

was black. This is appropriate imagery for the play, indeed, for tragic performance as a whole, since the assimilation between wedding and funeral imagery in Greek drama is very strong. The set and costume designs of Mark Leese and Caroline Grebbell played on that imagery to the maximum. For instance, the stage set is basic and the props are few in order to give greater prominence to the gifts of the tiara and shawl on velvet cushions presented to Glauke.

Ramya Kannan for *The Hindu Times* admires the new role and function of the Chorus Lochhead has employed in her version, dropping the conventional omniscient narrator status and presenting them: ‘saucy, brutally frank and dripping with dry wit and sarcasm’ (Kannan 2000). Coulbourn also admires the compelling role afforded by the playwright to the Chorus as ‘a timeless voice of wronged femininity which she nails at every turn’ (Coulbourn 2000). In performance, the timelessness of the Chorus is emphasised through costume and makeup which resembles eighteenth-century fashion-dolls. Female members were dressed in grey eighteenth-century style bodices and skirts worn over hip-pads. Male members of the Chorus have shaven heads; female members have their hair set into tight corkscrew curls. The artificial eighteenth-century style make-up of white face, pencilled brows, rose-bud lips, and rouged cheeks added to the doll-like appearance. Jeanette Winterson for the *Guardian* writes that Medea is a role model with specific powers over the national psyche and adds:

I suspect women are more ruthless than men, for the simple reason that once a woman has broken through the considerable barriers of conditioning and instinct that feminise her, there is no motive for compassion. (Winterson 2000)

In the view of Lloyd Llewellyn-Jones, Lochhead strengthened the audience’s sympathy with the character of Glauke (2000). In the opinion of the same critic, both the text and the performance brought out much of the black humour of the original. However, central to the success of the staging of Lochhead’s version was the casting of Maureen Beattie as the foreign sorceress Medea:

...we were shown a sexy, voluptuous, humorous (very funny, in fact), loving, loyal, passionate woman brought low by circumstances beyond her control. (2000)

McLaren adds that *theatre babel* wanted for the Scottish Medea to have an exotic voice, which was as ambiguous in origin as her character: a mid-European accent, which according to McLaren was Macedonian, for Maureen Beattie – Polish; and for the members of the audience it sounded like Polish-Jewish (Llewellyn-Jones 2000). Further to this, the expressive gestures of East European and mastery of language, ‘with wonderful ‘put-downs’, double entendres, and fervent exclamations’, distinguished the protagonist as ‘a compelling Other, a foreigner about whom one longs to learn more’ (Llewellyn-Jones 2000). Further adding to the ambiguity of the character of Medea in performance is the choice of costume: a red silk-velvet gown with a boned bodice and full skirt worn over small hip-pads. Tight-fitting sleeves slashed at the wrists and allowed to hang down in eighteenth-century Russian court dress style also reminded the audience of Polish-style dress.

The cultural divide expressed in the text as sexual difference, McLaren expresses also in a visually dramatic way through the costumes. Apart from being predominantly black in contrast to Medea’s red dress to show her as outsider, the female cast along with the protagonist and the Chorus are dressed in eighteenth-century costumes. In contrast, Glauke and the male characters appear in nineteenth-century garments in black.

In an interview with Maureen Beattie, I discovered that the actress’s background is pantomime and variety theatre which has influenced the play hugely. Apart from Lochhead and McLaren and his visual skills as graphic designer, important for the success of the project was also Carol Ann Crawford – a brilliant voice coach, who performs the part of the Nurse in the play. Thanks to her the cast did not experience any problems with the Scots accents included in the play.

Further to the construction of the protagonist Beattie felt that she failed to understand her character but found sympathy with her. Perhaps part of the problem lies in the ambiguity of the character in the way Lochhead decides to depict her as both a fictional character(part of a story) and a real character (contemporary image). Beattie imagined Medea as being in a boxing ring in her head – sparring with someone and

then going back to speak to the Chorus. She seduces the audience and wins them over to her side: ‘My background as a variety actress helped me to talk with the audience...’ (Beattie 2012).

To the question about whether there were any performance challenges, Beattie answered that the only thing they did not get quite right was the end: ‘it’s a very difficult thing; if we’ve got to do it again that is the thing we will try to change – we did all the instructions in the text...’ (Beattie 2012). For McLaren the only serious challenge they encountered was during their international tour in India, where they realised that the non-European audiences are not that well familiar with the European classics and further cultural adaptation of the text was expressed as a need for the complete understanding of the contemporary meanings the playwright and director wanted to speak to their audiences. However, the play and its subject had an immediate effect on the Indian spectators and divided the audience according to their gender reflecting upon the woman question in the local context. McLaren claims that the audience was very sensitive to the ironic moments in the play and responded adequately to them.

Further to Lochhead’s textual framing of the dramatic space, McLaren’s stage design and Kay Fisher’s light-design contribute to the post-colonial narrative:

A large black square, raised acting area surrounded on three sides by the audience; a white backcloth, stretched taut, was suspended behind the performance area; this was interset with a plain doorway that extended into a short ‘corridor’ created from black curtains and by a black back-curtain into which cast members disappeared. A wide stepped rostrum ran the length of the back of the stage and provided a slightly higher acting area. The doorway was the main entrance for many of the leading characters, although cast members could also enter in front of the backcloth, and from the sides of the auditorium. The house of Creon and Glauke, for example, was ‘located’ behind the audience seating blocks.

This stage design enigmatically resembles the amphitheatrical shape of ancient Greek theatres with a ‘skele’ raised space and a dark corridor for the entrance and exit of most of the characters. The breaking up of the classical dramatic space is shown through the choice of the house of Kreon and Glauke, which is behind the

audience's seats. Thus, the audience is turned both into a spectator and performer and also helps them view the play from the 'side' of Kreon. Further to the design:

The entire floor of the main acting space was strewn with fragments of what appeared to be grey cloths (very fine, like chiffon); sometimes these took on the appearance of fallen leaves. Due to the lightness of these cloths, the stage was filled with a fluent movement, because every time a character moved across the stage, the gossamer coverings were set in motion too.

Those cloth pieces could be interpreted as a visual representation of cinders, metaphorically expressing sorrow in classical Greek tragedy.

Another framing of the dramatic space is achieved through the light-design:

The white cyclorama back-drop was given a series of colour washes (a combination of pale reds bleeding into a pink and gold) which contrasted beautifully with the black set and costumes. At moments of intense drama, as, for example, when Medea murders her infants off stage, the cyclorama turned a brilliant bright red, the colour of Medea's gown and, of course, of the blood of her victims.

Lloyd Llewellyn-Jones for the Project reference adds that the main acting area was given a general white wash, while in contrast, specials were used only for the messenger's speech at the death of Creon and Glauke, to define it as an important dramatic moment, similarly to the use of brilliant red for the death of the children.

*Thebans* (2003) was written three years later as a separate project with the same theatre and artistic director of *Medea* but with the ambitious goal of retelling a whole cycle of narratives.

From a conversation with Lucianne McEvoy (Antigone)

Interviewer: What makes it Scottish?

Lucianne: Liz, I think. Because it is from such a Scottish voice. And I think because it's visceral in a way that I think English versions can be quite sanitized and can be quite cold in the same way Frank McGuinness tends to translate the classics with an Irish colloquialism and a familiarity to his language in terms of Irish sayings.

I think it is a Scottish version but in being a Scottish version it's open to be anyone's version because it has been reclaimed in a sense by a local world. A voice that comes from a community rather than an empire. (McEvoy 2012)

My conversation with Lucianne did not start with this question but finished with it. I chose this question as a start of this section because it elicits two main issues: the

need for a Scottish version and its justification as a voice of the community, which is witty incorporated in the title 'Thebans'. The title should be read for its double meaning: 1) the people who live in Thebes – the community; 2) as an adjective to define the story which deals with the tragic lives of royal members who govern Thebes.

Almost the whole adaptation as poetic language and images relies on the ironic doublemeaning of the words Lochhead had chosen to retell the story in and thus relate it to the contemporary world of her audience. The choice, as already discussed in Chapter Three, is governed by the idea of contemporisation and cultural reflection and introduces the question of internal colonisation and dual identity as part and parcel of the old nationalist model in Scotland and the prerequisites for hypocrisy.

This, in the view of Jennifer Harvie (1993, pp. 136-139), is one of the preferred means of revision of popular narratives by the playwright in order to introduce detachment from the text as a form of meta-narrative and meta-dramatic performance. This view is also supported by Ksenija Horvat in her review of the play, according to which the performance created a sense of disengagement with the emotions of the audience (Horvat 2003). The introduced detachment is a Brechtian style of dramatic interpretation of cultural identity already employed by the playwright in her version of the national model with the figure of Mary Queen of Scots. In *MQS*, the common people are also presented and act like children similarly to the image of the Chorus, i.e. the Theban community, as a reference to the internally colonised and oppressed people. For instance, the Chorus pleads to Oedipus for help:

Once more save your children...

OEDIPUS: Subjects my children... (*Thebans*, p. 4)

Here the community link is described in familial terms, i.e. Oedipus is the father of the nation. His self-exile leads to the fatherless status of the local community (a recurrent image in previous adaptations by the playwright), however, Jocasta does not take his place – she is only the mother of her children. Hence, there is no gender reading of the national trope. This is further clarified by the specific reading of the Sphinx Lochhead offers as a female creature:

CHORUS: her cruel-lovely woman's mouth  
Laughing  
You answered her riddle  
You outwitted her  
And for this famed Oedipus  
We can never forget  
You. (*Thebans*, p.4)

Psychologically read, these lines establish Oedipus not only as the Father but also the Man, the holder of truth and human reason. The cultural implication of the victory over the female Sphinx, resonates with Scullion's observation of the gender cultural readings of the Scottish and the mythological, *unheimlich* female figure in them, which has been discarded in this new cultural model. The cultural split is still present but the foreignness inside is replaced with the familiar, known, brotherly male exile figure of Polyneikes, thus displacing women from the national identity debate.

The adaptation came as a response to the events of 9/11 and coincided with the SARS epidemic and the conflict between Palestine and Iraq, all of which are alluded to either in the playtext, or in the performance. This resonates with Hall's observation of the frequent post-colonial adaptations of *Antigone* as a contemporary response and reflection on war conflicts (Hall 2004).

In the director's note, McLaren expressed clearly the motifs behind *Thebans* staging:  
to rearticulate ancient Greek drama for a contemporary Scottish audience. We had tried to build on the lessons we had learnt about Greek drama, and continue to experiment and learn (2002, p. ii)

Lochhead writes in the foreword of the published version that it was devised for this specific *theatre babel* cast and her recent experimental work with the Greek Chorus in *Medea* was also a source of inspiration. Regarding the language, she aims at clarity and plainness. The main story is transformed into a story about a cursed family and the powerless suffering citizens under its rule. Further plot changes are that all the roles of the messengers are given to family members (*Thebans*, p. iii).

The writer's comment reveals that she again approached the ancient Greek plays as stories. Lorna Hardwick finds a stress on narrative, especially in the Oedipus and Jocasta sequences, which is a drawback in the critic's view, as it 'left little time or

space for exploration of the subtleties of the poetry or for reflection on the moral and spiritual issues and overarching themes of responsibility and fate' (Hardwick 2002). This revisionist approach corresponds to a recent tendency (seen at its most developed in the John Barton/Peter Hall 'Tantalus') for Greek material to be selected and adapted in a manner which emphasises narrative of the myths and legends rather than the refiguration of myth through the conventions and poetry of Greek drama (Hardwick 2002). However, Philip Fisher (2003) found the writing generally poetic and the narrative drive fierce as the action flies along. He also liked the modern costume and design and thought that the light circle design of Kai Fischer was effective.

The action is again conventionally transposed to the local culture, which corresponds to the British Isles more than to Scotland solely due to the choice of language – mainly English and Scottish English. The only speaker of Scots is the Guard. Lynne Walker considers the pruning of these myths, and fleshing out the bones of the stories in plain English, with a Scottish slant, loses something of their emotional impact. She feels the characters needed a slower unfolding (Walker 2003). Joyce McMillan for *The Scotsman* considers Lochhead not to have been tempted to repeat the linguistic style she achieved in *Medea* because of a 'post-devolution passion to avoid any hint of parochialism' (McMillan 2003).

The same theme of the relationship between family and power hierarchy is introduced as a direct political debate and used as a setup of the cultural scene in the play. The focus on the family is stronger than in the original which strips off the thematic richness and leads to timeless existence of the characters on stage. Some of the characters, however, appear as two dimensional (e.g. Antigone), and inhuman, puppet-like, which to an extent could be interpreted as the plastic face of political machinations and a performance of stifled identity in a story about a dysfunctional family. The performance is harshly criticised by Lyn Gardner (*The Guardian*):

Graham McLaren's production may be aiming for some kind of stillness, but it is so static, it looks as if the cast had been glued to the stage. The space is totally unsympathetic and encourages declamatory performances. And the use



of a few photographs at the start, including one of Saddam, is a mere nod to contemporary relevance. (Gardner 2003)

Gardner's criticism speaks of a failed contemporisation of the classic for Scottish audience, whose characters' unnatural presence and coldness did not allow the audience to identify with or connect to their story. Moreover, director McLaren admits that each part needed more time in order to unfold and be followed with ease by the spectators, who, in the words of the director, after an hour and half performance left the theatre in complete silence as though they had witnessed a car crash. Another possible explanation could be that the tragedy plays were still unknown to the audiences, or at least the specific application of playtexts by the director and playwright (in particular *Phoenician Women*) were, along with the sudden multi-referencing to contemporary events on a textual and visual level with central importance of body politics.

The two main source texts, Sophocles's *The Theban Plays* (1947) and Euripides's *Phoenician Women* (2011), used by the playwright intensified the layout of ideas. As mentioned earlier, Fischer-Lichte supports the idea that Sophocles believed in the power of human reason to project pure political identity of the democratic polis and the powers of language to serve at its best the body (2002, p. 25). Euripides offered re-evaluation of reason, which led to re-evaluation of linguistic functions (2002, p. 27). By bringing these two clashing philosophies Lochhead stirs a rite of passages, i.e. she opens space for transformation of identities, which in *Thebans* is incomplete. The pure instrumental role of reason in the original Euripides' text is fundamental to the revision of Lochhead's. All male characters are on the path to self-discovery but are interrupted by an act of injustice which is bound with prophecy, i.e. an inhuman act of justice, to which Lochhead adds sympathy, for example the characters of Oedipus and Kreon. Fischer-Lichte claims that such subordination of reason to the physis in Euripides argues that 'the possibility of knowing oneself and constitution of one's own identity remains hidden' (2002, p. 30).

Moreover, the two-dimensional characterisation of female characters could be interpreted as a direct result of the dominant masculine cultural images in the play.

Cultural conceptions of bodies have been among the major vehicles of masculinism in the West. Phelan argues that ‘tropes of the body allow for particularly powerful migrations of concerns about gender and sexuality into political discourse’ (Phelan 1999, pp. 57-58). The citizen’s body is the normative male body which appears as phallic, i.e. as ‘impenetrable, a source but never a receptacle. In sharp contrast, feminine bodies are “castrated”, incomplete, and vulnerable. Their distance from the signifier of strength and purpose leaves them weak both in body and mind. ...’ (Phelan 1999, pp. 59-60).

Although Jocasta and Ismene are seen as incomplete bodies and vulnerable, subjected by the law of the father, Jocasta is slightly more undermining as she gives passage to her son but also enemy to the city. Furthermore, the image of the mother in Lochhead’s poetry contains duality, it is always:

... two faced  
At best, she wished you  
Into being. ...  
She doesn’t like you, she  
Prefers all your sisters, she  
Loves her sons... (2003, pp. 80-81)

The poem image of the mother can also be interpreted in the framework of Kristeva and the feminine: the mother is the site of the splitting. Interpreted with the cultural lens of Scottish identity she is the site of betrayal, which Lochhead subtly ironises in her version of the Greek tragedy with the reinterpreted, ambiguous character and role of Jocasta in the Theban story.

Antigone challenges the phallic body, which, in the way Lochhead presents it, is subverted – the male characters are irrational and driven by their passions, and the female characters are rational and call for peace, wisdom and justice.

Ironically, liberal theories have trouble with the embodiment of passion. Passions seem to be features of minds that have no clear connections to bodies (Phelan 1999, p. 62). That is why, perhaps, the embodiment of passions in the play is given to the gods, who epitomise human passions of jealousy, greed, ambition, hatred, blind desire for self-knowledge, etc.

Further to this, Gardner disapproves of the interpretation of *Antigone*, which fails to depict the theme about the futility of war and political resistance. She is supported in this also by McMillan: ‘in the final play, *Antigone*, both the text and the production begin to lose their resonance’ (Gardner; McMillan 2003). The actress who performed the role of Antigone shares that after reading the adapted text she realised how stubborn the character is, so much so that she could have been a very good dictator:

very like Kreon in lots of ways but she just stood on the opposite side of the line from him. And so she’s a very polar character I felt, and it reminded me of, you know, young female suicide bombers. (McEvoy 2012)

The source texts for the adaptation do not work in congruence, which in itself presents an opportunity to create narrative irony. The lack of good cohesion between the myths is productive for Lochhead, whose text again is seen as the main hero by *The Financial Times*:

What it does is encompass a magnificent range from modern demotic to verse like a granite monument; it expresses the individual and the civic, as personal and family obligations conflict with the governance of Thebes; the human and the divine. (Shuttleworth 2003)

The link between the three stories chosen by Lochhead is the character of Jocasta, thus implying indirectly a woman’s view of the war and local political identity. She also uses the metaphoric image of the mother as the proprietor of peace, who is the contemporary cultural exile in juxtaposition to the fictional cultural exiles in the story. In contrast, all the male characters in the play seem to be bound by ambition and selfishness, a view supported by Gerald Berkowitz for *The Theatre Guide London* (Berkowitz 2003). The characterisation of Jocasta follows closely the Euripidean version of the myth in *Phoenician Women*. Euripides’s narrative treats Jocasta as the closest character to all royal members and ascribes to her a motherly relationship with them. In such a way, Jocasta is turned into the unifying element, the emotional and rational centre of the story, and after her death the plot falls apart. The increased presence of Jocasta in Euripides is transposed directly by Lochhead in her version in which, again, the protagonist shows bigger self-consciousness and independence than the male characters (Euripides 2011, pp. xx–xxi).

Lucianne McEvoy describes Jocasta as:

a very humane, motherly and strong woman but also sickened, absolutely sickened by the realisation of what she'd done. (McEvoy 2012)

Jocasta's presence is quite ambiguous. At moments she uses self-irony:

Could-not-die's doomed to live to suffer... (*Thebans*, p. 35)

Then she becomes a narrator – she states her intentions with lines which are not present in the original:

JOCASTA: Thebans in my desperation I have brokered  
What I hope will be a truce... (*Thebans*, p. 35)

Compared to the character of Medea, Jocasta is not individualised as the conventional female figure who rejects gender signifiers of reproduction and motherhood. None the less, she is also presented as a sympathetic character:

JOCASTA: ... married to old man Laius when I was  
Hardly older than a child myself, this child  
Had no children to him... (*Thebans*, pp. 32–33)

The childlessness mentioned as a tragic sign of unhappy marriage, might not be such a negative character trait in the interpretation of Lochhead as applied in her adaptation of *Medea*. The individualised female image of Jocasta is lost with her new marriage to Oedipus and thus subsumed (colonised) by the national in the cultural interpretation of the metaphors used by the playwright. In the same speech, Jocasta refers to her first marriage is a 'barren union' (*Thebans*, p. 33), i.e. a direct remark about the old political union between Scotland and England. Jocasta's image of her past is highly poeticised: England is the old man and Scotland is the young, innocent and almost childlike woman. But her speech/act is completely suppressed and silenced by the speech and acts of Oedipus, who is another colonised body (allegedly 'foreign') brought to its degradation and expelled in self-exile.

In Lochhead's version, Polyneikes and Eteokles are twin brothers. The decision to have the brothers as twins could be interpreted as a reference to the split identity of Scotland. Furthermore, it informs the nationalist beliefs for political equality between Scottish and English in the context of British identity or narrates the old nationalist claim of such equality as holders of dual identity, i.e. Scottish and British. Ironically,

Lochhead has charged the twins with equally shared ambitions for power, which could not be hidden from the eyes of the Thebans:

CHORUS: what this rebel says explains his point of view.  
we must say that what he says makes sense to us  
Is not the man cynical indeed who says  
If Polyneikes had the throne  
He'd be singing a quite different tune?...  
(*Thebans*, p. 42)

The Chorus not only describes men in power as cynical but also corrupt in their thinking and empowered by their political position, expressed with the words: 'Might is *not* right it's madness'(Lochhead, p. 43). In the original, the Chorus is a steady supporter of justice, who are performed as a group believing in cultural myths but also holding the cultural wisdom and lesson of history rooted in the folklore stories they are raised with:

Men fighting hand to hand  
Brother fighting brother to the death  
This is a bad dream we've had  
Since we were children  
We are descendants of the sown men  
(Euripides, pp. 54-55)

The same story also appears as a mythological text. The community is trapped in the fate of prophet voices, which is personified through the personal combat between the two brothers, a type of a metaphor for a doomed community. 'The sown men' refers to the birth of armed men from the teeth of a dragon in ancient Greek mythology, which Lochhead revisits with the contemporary images of the war conflict between two brotherly nations in the East, introducing a subtle reference also to the long ongoing unsettled argument in the Scottish debate and anti-English sentiments.

The frequently applied duality in terms of characterisation as a means of ironic contrast and part of the textual performance could be also interpreted in the light of a verbal mask of hypocrisy in the sense of Molière and Lochhead's utilisation of the verbal mask in her version of *Tartuffe* – but in a different way. Oedipus is a selfish tyrant and distrusts everyone including his closest family. He is also, similarly to the others men in power, very hypocritical which is emphasised through the application of italics:

CHORUS: King Oedipus please spare his life

OEDIPUS: and lose my own?  
Oh let him go if you say so  
Against my better judgment  
I'll *bow to the will of the people*  
We'll see if we all live to regret it (*Thebans*, p. 15)

Oedipus speaks directly to the people (Chorus), whereas in the original he speaks to the Priest. The idea behind it is perhaps that there is openness and direct connection with the people of Thebes, which from the very start is an ironic implication about democratic politics. It ironises the implied democratic intellect and egalitarian sentiment as part of the function of the Greek tragedy viewed by Brown and Hardwick as either a debate between the private and the public, or as a post-colonial discussion about the differences between political and cultural identities in post-devolution Scotland:

OEDIPUS: ...I do not hide behind doors or diplomats  
I am here in person I am listening (*Thebans*, p. 3)

All the characters are contemporised, including Jocasta, who in the original is doubtfully fully religious but performs libations to Apollo. In Lochhead's version, Jocasta is a very rational person and sceptical towards all kinds of prophecy:

A prophet!  
Oedipus my darling  
Prophets charlatans every one  
Or self-deceivers  
No one should pay a blind bit of attention  
To what these seers say  
(*Thebans*, p. 16)

Jocasta finds the use of prophets untrustworthy, because they suffer from self-deception and whatever they say is untruthful, i.e. they are fools who speak irrational thoughts, narrating and ironising the previously discussed cultural mask of moderation or rationality. The same mask is also re-established through the use of three synonyms for the word 'prophet' ('charlatan' and 'self-deceiver' and the Scottish word 'seer'). In the original, the same idea is less emotionally and more plainly stated with an emphasis on man and his inability as a mortal to prophesy:

Jocasta: Oedipus, forget all this. Listen to me: no mortal can practise the art of prophecy, no man can see the future. (1947, p. 55)

The colloquial and poetic language which the playwright uses in this adaptation is very different from *Medea*. According to Hardwick, faithful to her comic style, Lochhead changed the tone of the plays by drawing out black humour and cynical observations on politics, motherly love and dysfunctional families. In addition, the playwright delighted in exploiting comedy and melodrama, clearly expressed in the Guard's recounting of the 'burial' of Polyniekas and Antigone's part in it.

Lochhead introduces verbal irony, playing on opposites like 'faith – lack of faith'; 'truth – lie' and 'knowledge – ignorance', in order to negate the image of the feminine in the face of Jocasta and the rest of the female characters ironically interpreted in this version as the source or disseminators of the curse. Contrary to Jocasta's pleas to stop digging into the story of his birth led by female premonitions, Oedipus mocks at her irrational thoughts and feelings:

OEDIPUS: Queen Jocasta my sweet snob  
So I might be a slave's son  
Or a bastard doesn't matter  
Many a great man's had a humble birth  
Or maybe I'm a demi god  
Some randy Olympian nailed  
A nymph with a thunderbolt or came  
In a shower of rain impregnating a servant girl...  
Some shepherdess's foot slipped.... (*Thebans*, p. 24)

Lochhead ironises the phallic obsession with truth and also ambitious beliefs in special descent and mythology about births of great minds which are often seen as godlike figures, e.g. Oedipus calls himself humbly king with a capital letter in order to demonstrate his divine link with the ultimate human knowledge and truth:

OEDIPUS: Jocasta you know me  
You know who I am the one  
Who won't be palmed off with half-truths  
Oedipus the excavator of old secrets  
I will know who and what I am (*Thebans*, p. 24)

The playwright inserts further verbal irony through applied duality of meaning and poetic similes like 'demi god', 'half-truth' in order to undermine the political power of the ruling members.

Oedipus shouts the words quoted above after Jocasta, who leaves the room because she is emotionally disturbed by the self-blinding deceptions and ambitions of her husband. In the scene to follow, Jocasta is driven to a state of agony and anguish. Lochhead has added Jocasta's presence at the meeting between Oedipus and the Corinthian (missing in the original), whose internal outbursts (*Thebans*, p. 23) stay silent to both of them. This is a typical device for inserting the female voice as discarded/abjected from the male cultural space, unseen and unheard in its internalised agony. In this version of the Greek play, the feminine voice does not succeed in disturbing the phallic/historic voice, although verbally Jocasta tries to interrupt it in order to save the man/men she loves. Furthermore, in the view of Gilbert & Tompkins, Jocasta is introduced as a silenced colonised body. The silence the protagonist performs is *inaudibility*, i.e. a character speaks but nobody on stage hears or acknowledges their words. They are audible solely to the audience, who witness a performed voice of resistance (*Thebans*, p. 23).

The Chorus is not only the body of the community; they are also the silent spectators of the unravelling tragic story of the fall of a man. In Lochhead's version, the Chorus frequently speak with a prophetic voice of wisdom and clarity of vision about the human nature of their ruling race:

CHORUS: truth is a great thing  
 A sore thing sometimes  
 But a good thing always  
 Always  
 Isn't this the truth about truth?  
 (*Thebans*, pp. 24-25)

The above lines also add a new layer of sarcasm to the madness of the ruling class members and their self-deception. The almost constant subversive function of the Chorus corresponds to the concept of the first of the silences, *muteness*, in post-colonial drama discussed previously. On the one hand, as a muted community they transmit meaning through normative discourse. On the other, as already mentioned earlier, Jocasta is depicted as the silent colonised subject and speaker from this community, who also subverts the phallic discourse through actions, physical and verbal, and transforms muteness into a language of resistance. Moreover, the Chorus



in Lochhead bears closeness to the Euripidean rather Sophoclean Chorus in the original, i.e. it is indirectly related to a foreign female body. The Chorus in Euripides is a group of foreign women who happen to believe in a different god/ different truth but they also are turned into the main narrators of the story, which also has been preserved in the revisited text by Lochhead with the idea of displaced cultural Other.

Further to the contemporisation of the characters, Lochhead also includes references to contemporary generations and diseases which fit well in the context as a subtext:

CHORUS: ... we young folk pervert our lives with poisons [drugs]  
That make false promises to kill our pain  
Our lovers kiss contagion ... [HIV]  
... new diseases daily invent themselves  
The spores of mutating pestilence  
In each polluted gasp of air we breathe... [SARS]  
(*Thebans*, p. 4)

According to McEvoy, Tiresias is not a real character – she has an ambivalent and androgynous presence, performed on stage as a half-naked woman and a blind seer. In Lochhead's version, she speaks like the Sphinx in riddles and mocks at the hypocritical ambition for self-knowledge of Oedipus:

TIRESIAS: solve this one

OEDIPUS: mock all you want that's the skill  
That made me King

TIRESIAS: ... See if you can solve this one and it'll drive you blind (*Thebans*, p. 12)

Lochhead turns the prophet's skill to foresee into a game of self-mockery, as in her version Tiresias can see not only the truth but also the actions and thoughts of Oedipus. And although she speaks them directly to him, Oedipus is so blind and deaf to her voice that he misinterprets the riddle and accuses Kreon of the murder of his father. In the original, Oedipus also mistrusts Tiresias but the argument is placed on the level of blindness of human mind and speculation: 'when you can prove me wrong/then call me blind' (Sophocles, p. 38).

Tiresias is a poetic presence, bearing resemblance to La Corbie and the Monster image in *Medea*, and her function is partially that of the Chorus in the classical Greek plays. As mentioned earlier, Tiresias could also be viewed as part of the

feminine/*unheimlich*. In performance, Tiresias is played as hermaphrodite with bare breasts, glasses with white covers over lenses, dark trousers, a walking stick, shaved head and cockney accent (possibly an ironic reference to central power in London). Perhaps the implications of foreignness in the identity of the contemporary image of La Corbie add to the prevalent cultural experience of belonging and displacement of the Scottish as a direct application of the post-devolution model of nationalism. Moreover, it indirectly refers to the contemporary Scottish-English political dialogue and the subordinate and marginalised role of the Scottish community in it.

Seen through Reizbaum's model of the fallen queen image, Jocasta, just like Mary Queen of Scots, is sacrificed in the name of the national, which speaks of abjected feminine, or an oppressed community as a form of social injustice. This oppressed community is performed by the Chorus, who is not omnipresent, because the whole story is being constantly told to them by family members. They also distrust the words of the seer and describe the plot from their own ironic point of view, playing with cave and mouth-poetic imagery in order to demythologise the voice of historical and political truth:

CHORUS: the word of god comes out of a cave...out of a cave/ or out of a prophet's mouth (*Thebans*, p. 12)

The birth of truth by the phallic culture is further ironised and depicted as the product of political negotiations between the two royal members of the Theban family, often mixed with the 'religious' in the voice of the prophet. The fabrication of truth is also an ironic process of hearing, mishearing, interpretation and misinterpretation, offered in italics in the text by Lochhead, which often serves to refer to the structured nature of language too:

Kreon hears/ or mishears it reports it or *distorts it*/ is with Oedipus one hundred per cent/*or not sends for Tiresias* or sends for him (*Thebans*, p. 12)

The Chorus is sometimes performed as a group of children, who see the war as a ridiculous thing and mock it:

CHORUS: nursery rhymes that soldiers sing moronic jingles  
Might drown the sound of our thudding hearts?  
Oh that's right we're terrified. (*Thebans*, p. 34)

Further to this, in the *theatre babel* staging, the Chorus is composed of the family members, who after performing their characters leave the white spot and become one of the community members who are visually silenced. The lack of free expression is physically depicted by the masks worn by the Chorus (some recognised them as SARS masks, not correct in the view of McEvoy). This adds a performance layer to the image of oppression and complicates the relationship between coloniser and colonised suggested by Hardwick as partially a process of self-colonisation. The coming in and out of character (playfulness in performance) supports the main argument about socially constructed identities.

Additionally, Lochhead has introduced a further opposition between the themes of love and war by making Haemon support Eteokles, Polyneikes is supported by Antigone, thus opposing the two lovers. Mirroring them are Jocasta, whose heart is on the side of Polyneikes, and her brother Kreon – on Eteokles side, separating brother from sister as an addition to the brother against brother war of the twins. As a result, the common folk, the Thebans, appear as pure victims of the ambitions for power and greed of their rulers. This is similar to the point of narration of the play *MQS*, but the colonised body in the early production is invisible, whereas in *Thebans* the colonised body is visible on stage through the character of the Chorus, although left in shadow and silenced.

The sense of oppression is further increased with the Guard and his behaviour – although this also brings humour due to the application of Scots and the way the narrative develops:

... I know I'm sweatin so I am  
Cannae get a breath  
But that's no because I've been running  
Because I've no been  
I've been walking very slowly  
Two steps furrir wan step back humming and hawing...  
(*Thebans*, p. 63)

Thus, Lochhead breaks the narrative of the tragic with comic – the Guard is the only character who speaks Scots in the play and his appearance might be interpreted in various ways. Following the poet's tendency of presenting self-ironical cultural

images on stage, it may be seen as the source of inadequate contemporary reaction of the members of the local culture to politics and political events of war conflicts. This reaction could be interpreted both unaffected by those events, and on the contrary, as a visualisation of community muteness and despair, which often finds a release through the comical. For instance, the Guard resembles the poetic image of 'The Man in the Comic Strip' poem in *The Colour of Black and White* who runs haphazardly and does not know the difference between 'the thinks bubble and the speech balloon' (2003, pp. 4-5). It is his mouth that is always getting him into trouble, leaving him in a state of constant distress and muteness: 'his scream is a total zero and he knows it' (2003, pp. 4-5).

This idea is reiterated at the end of the play by the Chorus at the sight of the apocalyptic aftermath referring to the 9/11 event:

...when we should have spoken out we were silent  
Kept our heads down survived thus far  
(*Thebans*, p. 88)

Another interpretation could be that the Guard is a subtle reminder to the audience of the link between the culture of the spectators in the story presented on stage (truthful or not) and the mirror function of self-reflexivity the playwright narrates through the retellings of the classics.

The curse of the royal family in *Thebans* is a metaphor for the cursed British family – more evidence is found in the performance discussion with Lucianne McEvoy. The nationalities of the actors somehow map an intriguing idea: Antigone is played by an Irish actress, Ismene – Northern Irish (not so brave and totally submissive to her uncle Kreon, who personifies England), Kreon – English; his sister Jocasta is Scottish, who is sacrificed together with Antigone. Such a performance choice, in the reading of Reizbaum, perhaps links the common Celtic national tropes of Irish and Scottish narratives. The connection of Antigone and the Irish is present in the text too with the appearance of a mythological creature:

Guard: Eventually it's all over and that's when we see her  
Screaming like a banshee... (*Thebans*, p. 68)

Further textual references cannot be clearly identified due to the verbal play on duality in meanings, constantly constructed and deconstructed, but such references can be sensed in the characterisation in performance and its reception. For instance, the catastrophic ending in the play where the only survivors, Kreon and Ismene, wish for death at the sight of the tall cities brought to ashes, smoke, horror and dust (*Thebans*, p. 88) corresponded to the effect the play had on the audience, in the opinion of the director:

I killed it for different banal practical reasons. It was three tragedies and we agreed we would play in Edinburgh at the Festival. What I have been learning about tragedies is you need to, afterwards, take yourself through a tragic story, to get the conflict, to get the interest, it is so compressed. And there is, hopefully, some catharsis in the end. I did not do that call. People have come to see the show and they would come out silent, as though they have been to a funeral. (McLaren 2010)

The play also has a circular structure, similarly to *Medea*, but it is thematically presented: the family stays in the vicious circle of curse. The Antigone story seems to be told from the point of view of her sister Ismene in which the gods are impersonated male passions, such as the pride of Kreon, which crushes him; the fanatic search for truth and self-knowledge of Oedipus, which leads to his blindness; and the greediness for power and ambition of the two brothers, which blinds them to their love.

Antigone means 'opposed to mother' and also 'in the place of a mother'. She is a highly poeticised image who enters a marriage ceremony with death. The whole narrative is an agonising image of a family falling apart, torn between personal and political duties. Antigone is a replacement for the mother figure but her opposite (mirror reflection) could also be seen as the Other self-image of the feminine. The fact that both Jocasta and Antigone find their deaths could be interpreted as an act of abjection of the feminine by the phallic body, i.e. negated rationality and love which both female characters are armed with in the versions of the Greek plays by Lochhead. Moreover, the playwright offers an interesting development of the exile theme in relation to cultural hybridity in this adaptation in particular. In the first play, the self-exiled father is an irony to the fatherless state of the Scottish as an act of self-

punishment (self-abjection of the foreign self) in which Jocasta, the mother, has been silenced and abjected later on in the play. The returned exiled son, Polyneikes, is not peacefully accepted but perceived as a major threat from which stems the whole conflict in the play, therefore he is perceived as the semiotic, feminine presence by the symbolic. A possible assumption could be that Lochhead has attributed feminine features to these exile characters in compliance with the transnational image of women's identity suggested by Kristeva. The third exile, Antigone, as a replacement for the mother of the nation, is ironically punished and abjected, the same way the other exiles are fated in the revision offered by Lochhead and further reinforced by the performance ideas of the director McLaren.

Apart from the self-observation insertion by the playwright of Jocasta, which dramatically works as subjectification of the space, the director of *Thebans* applied a complex framing in order to revision the main stories of the characters through visual performative expressions like light and masks. The light design is a white circle space for individualisation of each character and also a space of power. The Chorus as community members stand in the darkness, outside the light circle to signify exclusion from knowledge and power, i.e. of being politically oppressed and invisible. They also wear masks to further imply power oppression and lack of voice. As already outlined, such presentation of the Chorus transgresses the conventional gender-race link in the post-colonial discourse as a marker of social and power inequality in order to develop the socio-linguistic discourse about language war suggested by Lakoff in which gender roles are language constructs. In the view of the same critic, since language is politically marked, the battles over it are 'infrequently fought over performatives' and their specific context for use (2000, pp. 22-23).

In addition, McLaren introduces one more framing of the space – a screen showing a movie at the background to break the theatrical (maternal) gaze, in the view of Freedman, with the cinematic, male gaze due to a 'desire to see oneself seeing' (Freedman 1990, p. 58). The maternal gaze in general introduces the infant into the social order:

it does not simply offer the infant a stable, cohesive image, but one that changes, that is not always as the infant would have it to be, that reacts to the infant's gaze and reflects it differently. (Freedman 1990, p. 66)

In conclusion, the post-colonial reading of Greek plays by Lochhead follows the established conventions of adaptations of classical plays for Scottish audiences with a focus on cultural identity as a political discourse of national identity, and reflects upon the trend of study of the relationship between coloniser and colonised as defined by Hardwick. Both adaptations problematise the issue of self-colonisation and the new national model of cultural hybridity. In *Medea*, it is the open, multicultural image of the Scottish society that is questioned. In *Thebans* the invisible colonised image of the colonisers and the disrupted political equality as the assumed right of the Scottish is critically translated into homogenous cultural hybrid images.

Both plays also comply with the gendered national discourse suggested by Reizbaum and correspond to the study of the feminine as the mother function in the sex difference question in the theory of Kristeva, a perspective which Lochhead applies in her revision of the playtexts. She approaches the originals as narratives and utilises poetic and dramatic devices in order to resignify the colonised body (female body). Both plays also offer a twist in the ending, which is more expressive in the revision of *Medea* than in *Thebans* due to a difference in the applied model of interpretation of the split cultural identity and the overarching theme of betrayal. Lochhead also keeps her established preference for comical transpositions in the target culture and explores the dark comic energies in the plays by the means of verbal and non-verbal ironies, meta-narratives and meta-theatrical devices.

*Medea* questions the dominant view of Scottish identity as culturally hybrid and open through the means of gender/sex difference. *Thebans* contest it through a complex relationship between colonised (Chorus) and coloniser. Part of the difference between the plays could be due to the choice of language: in *Medea* Lochhead applies various registers of Scots and Scottish English, whereas in *Thebans* the playwright uses predominantly Scottish English with the exception of the Guard,

with the intention of transgressing the tragic narrative. Additionally, the plainness and rich poetic/verbal devices, used as a highly poetic rather than dramatic language, led to the impression of stillness on stage. This was further enhanced with the performance choice of the artistic director Graham McLaren to keep the Chorus dressed in black and still on stage with their mouths covered with masks, with the intention of showing the invisibility and silencing of the community as an expression of political oppression.

Medea is the outsider's voice which narrates the cultural image according to the established model of culturally split trope of representation in Scottish theatre since the 1990s, which in the play receives visibility. In *Thebans*, Lochhead introduces again a female narrator, Jocasta, who, in contrast, is a metaphor for the contemporary cultural exile and links to each exile in each myth – Oedipus, Polyneikes and Antigone. Jocasta is also a visible colonised body but not foreign anymore and completely silenced. The foreignness inside the Scottish community is narrated through the male image of Polyneikes, which complies with the post-devolution masculine readings of national identity as a site of simultaneous belonging and displacement. Furthermore, Polyneikes informs the 'returned exile' theme seen as a trait of post-devolution theatre in Scotland by Scullion. Lochhead deconstructs it with irony: the character does not bring peace, which directly questions the idea of cultural hybridity after Devolution. The betrayal theme is also complicated with a meta-narrative about the betrayal of the Theban rulers to the Theban people, the Chorus. Moreover, Tiresias, the poetic figure which could find an equivalent in the La Corbie character of *MQS* as the mythical, historical voice of the nation is also displaced. This is a metaphorical reference for the English ruling voice and therefore is distrusted and constantly ironised.

Both plays comply with the political socio-linguistic discourse described by Lakoff as 'language war', for which the established post-colonial link of gender with race is disrupted and rendered as the mere play of social roles and 'performatives'. The introduced post-colonial subjects are notoriously granted the free will and consciousness to disrupt the dominant narratives. Medea chooses to take a linguistic escape and avoid the linguistic control framework of the phallic culture, ironically drawn as apocalyptic at the end of the play. Jocasta, the Chorus and the Guard in



*Thebans* verbally and non-nonverbally subvert the master narrative most of the time through their silence, which is turned into a performative site of resistance by the playwright.

#### References:

AINTLEY, A., 1990. The Ethics of Sexual difference In: FLETCHER, J. & A.BENJAMIN, eds. *Abjection, Melancholia, and Love: The Work of Julia Kristeva*. NY, London: Routledge. pp. 53-62.

BEATTIE, M., 2012. *Transcript*. Interview by M, Paraskevova. Glasgow: Glasgow Citizen's Theatre. 13 June.

BERKOWITZ, G., 2003. Review of *Thebans* by Liz Lochhead. *The Theatre Guide London*. [online]. 14 August. [viewed 03 May 2013]. Available from: <http://www.theatreguidelondon.co.uk/reviews/edinburgh2003.htm>

BOYD, S.J., 1993. The Voice of Revelation: Liz Lochhead and Monsters In: CRAWFORD, R. and A. VARTY, eds. *Liz Lochhead's Voices*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. pp. 38-40.

BURIAN, P., 1997. Tragedy Adapted for Stages and Screens: the Renaissance to the Present In: EASTERLING, PE., ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 218-233.

CLUNE, J., 1993. Hearing Voices: Monologues and Revues In: CRAWFORD, R. and A. VARTY, eds. *Liz Lochhead's Voices*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. pp. 75-92.

CORBETT, J., 2006. 'Nae mair pussyfuttin. Ah'm aff, Theramenes': Demotic Neoclassical Drama in Contemporary Scotland' In: MCGONIGAL, J. & K. STIRLING, eds. *Ethically Speaking: Voice and Values in Modern Scottish Writing*. Amsterdam, NY: Rodopi. pp. 28-33.

COULBOURN, J., 2002. 'A Medea for today'. Review of *Medea* by Liz Lochhead. The Premiere Dance Theatre, Toronto. *The Jam Canoe – Canada*. [online]. 10 April. [viewed 03 May 2013]. Available from: <http://jam.canoe.ca/Theatre/Reviews/M/Medea/2002/04/10/pf-742224.html>

DONATI, C., 2000. Review of *Medea* by Liz Lochhead. Scotsman assembly, Edinburgh. *The Edinburgh Guide*. [online]. [viewed 03 May 2013]. Available from: [http://www.edinburghguide.com/festival/2000/fringe/review\\_theatre7.shtml](http://www.edinburghguide.com/festival/2000/fringe/review_theatre7.shtml).

EURIPIDES, 1994. *Medea*. FREDERIC, R. & K. MCLEISH, transl. London: Nick Hern Books Ltd. pp. 54-79.

EURIPIDES, 2011. *Electra, Phoenician Women, Baccae, Iphigenia at Aulis*. LUSCHNIG, C.E. & P. WOODRUFF, transl. USA: Hackett Publishing Company.

FISCHER-LICHTE, E., 2002. *History of European Drama and Theatre*. London, NY: Routledge.

FREEDMAN, B., 1990. Frame-Up: Feminism, Psychoanalysis, Theatre In: CASE, S. E., ed. *Performing Feminisms: Feminist Critical Theory and Theatre*. Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press. pp. 58-66.

GARDNER, L., Review of *Thebans* by Liz Lochhead. Assembly Rooms, Edinburgh. *The Guardian*. [online]. 7 August. [viewed 03 May 2013]. Available from: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/stage/2003/aug/07/theatre.edinburghfestival20035>

GALE, M.B. & J.F. DEENEY, 2012. *Routledge Drama Anthology and Sourcebook from Modernism to Contemporary Performance*. Routledge. pp. 55-805.

GAY, J. d. & L. GOODMAN, 2001 (2003). 'Seizing Speech and Playing with Fire: Greek Mythological Heroines and International Women's Performance' In: J. D. GAY and L. GOODMAN, eds. *Languages of Theatre Shaped by Women*. Intellect: Bristol, UK.

GILBERT, H. & J. TOMPKINS, 1996; 2002. *Post-colonial Drama*. London: Routledge.

GROZS, E., 1995. Space, time and bodies In: GROZS, E., ed. *Space, Time, and Perversion: Essays on the Politics of Bodies*. Routledge.

HALL, E., 1997. The Sociology of Athenian Tragedy In: EASTERLING, P.E., ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Greek tragedy*. Cambridge; Cambridge University Press. pp. 93-126.

HALL, E., 2004. Introduction: Why Greek Tragedy in Twentieth Century? In: HALL, MACINTOSH and WRIGLEY, eds. *Dionysus Since 69: Greek Tragedy at the Dawn of the Third Millennium* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

HARDWICK, L., 2011. Classical Theatre in Modern Scotland: the Democratic Stage in: HARDWICK, L. & C. STRAY, eds. *A Companion to Classical Receptions*. Wiley: Blackwell.

HARDWICK, L., 2003. Review of *Thebans* by Liz Lochhead. *Classical Receptions in Drama and Poetry in English from c.1970 to the Present*. [online].The Open University. [viewed 02 May 2013]. Available from: <http://www2.open.ac.uk/ClassicalStudies/GreekPlays/Reviews/2684.htm>

HARVIE, J. & J. MCDONALD, 1993. Putting New Twists to Old Stories: Feminism and Lochhead's Drama In: CRAWFORD, R. and A. VARTY, eds. *Liz Lochhead's Voices*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. pp. 124-147.

HORVAT, K., 2003. 'Glimpse of the opulent future'. Review of *Thebans* by Liz Lochhead. *The Edinburgh Guide*. [online] 5 August. [viewed 03 May 2013]. Available from: [http://www.edinburghguide.com/aande/theatre/reviews/b/blood\\_and\\_ice\\_rlt.shtml](http://www.edinburghguide.com/aande/theatre/reviews/b/blood_and_ice_rlt.shtml) [www.EdinburghGuide.com](http://www.EdinburghGuide.com).

JACKSON, S. & S. SCOTT, eds. 1996. *Feminism and Sexuality*. Edinburgh University Press.

KANNAN, R., 2002. Contemporary Medea. Review of *Medea* by Lochhead. Theatre babel in Chennai, India. *The Hindu Times*. [online] 20 February. [viewed 15 March 2010]. Available from: <http://www.hindu.com/thehindu/lf/2002/02/20/stories/2002022001250200.htm>

KITTO, H.D.F., 1966 (1961; 1950; 1931). *Greek Tragedy: a Literary Study*. London: Methuen.

KRISTEVA, J., 1977. *About Chinese Women*. Transl. A. Barrows. London: Marion Boyars.

KRISTEVA, J., 1984. *Revolution in Poetic Language*. New York: Columbia University Press.

LAKOFF, R. T., 2000. *The Language War*. Berkley, LA, London: California University Press.

LEHNER, S., 2012. *Subaltern Ethics in Contemporary Scottish and Irish Literature: Tracing Counter-Histories* Palgrave Macmillan.

LOCHHEAD, L., 2000. *Medea*. London: Nick Hern Books Ltd.

LOCHHEAD, L., 2003. *Thebans*. London: Nick Hern Books Ltd.

LOCHHEAD, L., 2003. *The Colour of Black and White*. Edinburgh: Polygon.

MCEVOY, L., 2012. *Transcript*. Interview by M. Paraskevova. Glasgow. 23 March.

MCLAREN, G., 2010. *Transcript*. Interview by M. Paraskevova. Glasgow: Glasgow Youth Theatre. 10 March.

MCCLURE, L., 1999. *Spoken Like a Woman: Speech and Gender in Athenian Drama*. Princeton University Press.

MCMILLAN, J., 2003. Thebans: those eyes, that mouth. A review of *Thebans* by Liz Lochhead. Assembly Rooms, Edinburgh. *The Scotsman*. 07 August.

OPEN UNIVERSITY. 2000. Programme note to *Medea* by Liz Lochhead.

PERFORMANCE REVIEWS. 2000. *Classical Receptions in Late Twentieth Century Drama and Poetry in English*. [online]. The Open University Database. [viewed 4 June 2010].

Available from:  
<http://www4.open.ac.uk/csdb/ASP/ViewDetails.asp?ProductionID=2510> (Medea)  
<http://www4.open.ac.uk/csdb/ASP/ViewDetails.asp?ProductionID=2684> (Thebans)

PHELAN, S., 1999. Bodies, Passions, and Citizenship in Cass, S. F. (ed). *Feminism, Identity and Difference*. London: Hekman. pp. 56-62.

REIZBAUM, M., 2005. Gender and Nationalism in Scotland and Ireland : Making and Breaking the Waves In: MCLLAVANNEY, L. & R. RYAN, eds. *Ireland and Scotland: Culture and Society, 1700–2000*. Four Courts Press. pp. 190-197.

RIACH, A., 2005. *Representing Scotland in Literature, Popular Culture and Iconography: the Masks of the Modern Nation*. Basingstoke and NY: Palgrave McMillan.

SJOEHOLM, C., 2005. *Kristeva and the Political*. Routledge.

SPENCER, C. 2000. 'A magnificent Medea for the 21<sup>st</sup> century'. Review of *Medea* by Liz Lochhead. *The Telegraph*. [online]. [viewed 03 May 2013]. Available from:

<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/4724941/A-magnificent-Medea-for-the-21st-century.html>

*THE BRITISH THEATRE GUIDE*. 2000. Review of *Medea* by Liz Lochhead. [online]. 20 August. [viewed 02 May 2013]. Available from: <http://www.britishtheatreguide.info/articles/200808.htm>

SHUTTLEWORTH, I., 2003. Review of *Thebans* by Liz Lochhead. Edinburgh Fringe. *The Financial Times*. [online]. [viewed 1 May 2013]. Available from: <http://www.cix.co.uk/~shutters/reviews/03044.htm>

VARTY, A., 1993. Scripts and Performances In: CRAWFORD, R. and A. VARTY, eds. *Liz Lochhead's Voices*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. pp. 148-169.

VARTY, A., 1997. The Mirror and the Vamp: Liz Lochhead In: GIFFORD, D. and D. MCMILLAN, eds. *A History of Scottish Women's Writing*. Edinburgh. pp. 641-658.

WALKER, L., 2003. Review of *Thebans* by Liz Lochhead. *The Independent*. [online]. 13 August. [viewed 02 May 2013]. Available from: <http://www.questia.com/library/1P2-1779616/reviews-theatre-thebans-assembly-rooms-dinburgh>

WATLING, E.F., transl., 1947. *Sophocles: The Theban Plays*. Penguin Books Ltd.

WINTERSON, J., 2000. The Lure of Medea. Review of *Medea* by Liz Lochhead, *The Guardian*. [online]. [viewed 01 May 2013]. Available from: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/world/2001/aug/21/gender.uk2>

WILLIAMSON, M., 1990. A Woman's Place in Euripides In: POWELL, A., ed. *Euripides' Women and Sexuality*. Routledge.

## Chapter Five

### Scots in Performance and Post-colonial Female Bodies in *Educating Agnes and Miseryguts*

This chapter explores the female characterisation in the adaptations of the plays *L'Ecole des Femmes* and *Le Misanthrope* with the main idea of increased visibility of the colonial body (the feminine) as a site for performative resistance expressed through gender and race. It studies the feminine as a construct of language through verbal and social masks revealed in the plot structures and themes in which the education of women and their cultural assimilation in society (private and public

spheres) becomes a central area of exploration for the playwright. The socially constructed female identities in the plays refer to the melancholic manifestation of the Phallic Mother, already defined in Chapter One. The greater physicalisation of the female characters reveals the objectificatory function of the male gaze and introduces the colonial status of the subject via social inequality (subordinate position of women). Social inequality becomes a site of resistance expressed through the ironic image of war between the sexes (a central theme also in *Medea*), more transparently related to the state of fatherlessness, i.e. a lack of language as a marker for social oppression and silencing of women. Translated into the national discourse, Lochhead questions the aspect of self-colonisation of the 'newly freed' Scottish, who appear as both colonised and coloniser, and continues to challenge the discourse of internal colonisation with the characterisation of female protagonists.

Lochhead's *Miseryguts* (2002) and *Educating Agnes* (2008) are the latest adaptations of Molière's plays. They are part of the Scottish comedy tradition of transposing the French classics into Scots started in 1948 by Robert Kemp, the playwright and director of the Gateway Theatre in Edinburgh. Similarly to other plays from the 'MacMolière' family, these versions are devised with special care to provide good material for Scottish actors who traditionally are trained in the comedy genre.

In contrast to Kemp's *Let Wives Tak Tent* (a free domesticated transposition of the play in prose in the Lallans dialect), the second rendition of *L'Ecole Des Femmes* (1662) for Scottish audiences, *Educating Agnes*, preserves the rhyming style of Molière. Being the first Scottish adaptation by a woman playwright, it adds the contemporary issue of colonialism to the traditional themes in the original, such as wives' infidelity, modern individualism and the mask of hypocrisy. Apart from the textual revisions, the play in performance offers a second layer on the new theme. Both the playwright and the director of *theatre babel* cast a black actress in the lead role in their first production in 2008. Lochhead explains her decision in the forward to the published text as 'an attack on the question of inherent patriarchal and paternalistic sexual exploitation of the orphaned ward' (*Educating Agnes* 2008, p. 4).

The introduction of the female subject as post-colonial is not new for the playwright. Following the success of *Medea* (2000), *Miseryguts* (2002) and *Thebans* (2003), *Educating Agnes* is another, yet different, contemporary adaptation of the classics in demotic Scots which reflects upon cotemporary cultural and political identities.

Although Lochhead follows Kemp's tradition of free adaptation of Molière into Scots, her approach differs in terms of language and rhymes, which she accepts as part of the signature of the French playwright. Rhyming for Lochhead has always been a tool to introduce humour:

There is something fundamentally *comic* about rhyme, particularly with polysyllabic feminine rhymes, or outrageous near rhymes. (*Educating Agnes*, p. 6)

In the introduction to her previously successful adaptation of *Tartuffe* (1985), she explains how she arrived at the decision to rhyme couplets in a rather idiosyncratic way which she justifies to herself by calling it 'the rhythm of spoken Scots' (Lochhead 2002). This new demotic Scots rhythm, according to Stevenson, avoids the tedious repetitiveness of previous English translations<sup>xvi</sup> and matches Molière's genius of elegant conciseness of the rhymes<sup>xvii</sup> and 'brevity and aphoristic quality' (2004, p. 114).

Mugglestone views language use in Scotland as 'highly complex in the schema of differentiations it offers' and Lochhead's preoccupation with voice and its role in identity politics, as the natural choice for the foregrounding of social, gendered and geographical divisions in her work (1993, p. 94). Furthermore, the Scots language the playwright introduces is often in contrast to the established varieties (Burns or the conventional literary language): it is based upon the urban/ industrial variety 'regularly adopted as both poetic and dramatic vehicle by Lochhead' (Mugglestone 1993 pp. 96-97). For instance, in *Tartuffe*, the Scots used is called 'theatrical' by the playwright and, apart from Scotticisms of the 1930s, contains colloquialisms and some invented vocabulary, which, according to Mugglestone, does not 'dispute its links to actual Scots' (1993, p. 97). The characters shift registers in line with the

identities they wish to convey, and the main theme of hypocrisy is equally represented through a verbal mask and in non-linguistic ways.

Linguistically, the shift of registers is applied to reveal dual identity as in:

ARNOLPHE: Don't! I don't mean to blame  
You – but it wouldnae dae if we were aw the same.  
(Act I, p. 14)

In the lines above, Lochhead alternates Arnolphe's speech from English in the first line with Scots in the second, which he changes like garments according to whom he speaks and what ideas he shares. Additionally, the application of change in registers serves to reveal a character trait as in:

ARNOLPHE: Don't start! Yes, I'm old enough to be her papa.  
So what! In fact I have been in *loco parentis*  
(Act I, p. 14)

Arnolphe not only mixes formal words like 'loco parentis' with English inflected vocabulary from the French, such as 'papa', but the playwright uses the first phrase italicised in order to reveal silent irony, which introduces the character as a victim of vanity and inflated self-importance. Read with the idea of cultural/political identity, this dualism, as already discussed in Chapter One, corresponds to the notion expressed by the middle classes of equality between the Scottish and the English, which the playwright has expanded with some French and American vocabulary to refer to the neo-colonial influences at the time in terms with the post-devolution rhetoric of the international.

This performative function of Lochhead's Scots has also been noticed by Stevenson, who describes it as 'a comic element as powerful as any character or action' (2004, p. 115). One of the central roles the playwright ascribes to it is a metatextual function, also interpreted as dialogical and loaded with satire. Furthermore, as discussed in Chapter Three, Brown also observes the same metatheatrical function of Scots in adaptations of Greek plays, and claims that the use of Scots introduces a direct political debate.

*Educating Agnes* (2008) is a return to some anachronistic Scots but modernised and certainly more anglicised in its form and still distinctive and metatheatrical as in previous adaptations. Lochhead also uses more anglicised Scots in *Miseryguts* (2002)



and *Thebans* (2003) adapted in the same period of post-devolutionary Scotland which, in its essence as a new form of the playwright's stage medium, can be outlining particular changes in the cultural climate at the time. Perhaps, as the theatre critic Joyce McMillan suggests in her review of *Thebans*, Scotland does not want to look parochial anymore. Questionably, this could serve to explain the sudden shift to solely English idiom.

Lochhead's favourite themes in Molière, according to Varty are:

adolescent female friendship, class difference, English vs Scots, courtship and fashion rituals, clichés with political satire of the contemporary present (Varty 1993, p. 165)

It is difficult to follow closely the suggested generalisation but each of Lochhead's new adaptations of Molière speaks with its own registers and language in which the direct opposition between English and Scots is not always present. For instance, *Miseryguts* (2002) is set in modern Edinburgh and the language the characters use is still a rigorous demotic form of 'Scots', full of colloquialisms, clichés, catch phrases and Americanisms, which are not in direct opposition to the English idiom.

The theme of adolescent female friendship is not always present. Such a form of friendship can be found in *Educating Agnes* as it deals with the growth of a girl into a woman and her sexual awakening. However, it is not present in *Miseryguts*, because the main characters are beyond their adolescent stage of development. Further to this, class differences are necessary dramatic device for creating satire as power inequality is subverted: usually the lower classes, the servants, make fun of their masters (part of the commedia art) and power relationships are undermined.

Courtship and fashion rituals are central to the construction of the social context and cultural specifics, and clichés with political satire of the contemporary present are always present as Lochhead frequently expands the social with political satire. This could be interpreted in terms of Fischer-Lichte's belief about approaching European theatre and drama with the concept of rite of passages, already outlined in Chapter One, in order to reflect upon cultural identity. The two courtship systems dictate two different linguistic systems, which after been brought together, create space for the transformation of cultural identities or at least an attempt at their revision.

As mentioned in the previous chapter, a central argument in the political question of femininity in post-colonial Scotland is objectification by the law of the father and sexual exploitation expressed through difference in race and class. This double difference is used by the playwright to depict women still trapped in the old image of the ‘double knot in the peeny’, i.e. suffering from double oppression.

Lochhead’s verbal irony exceeds the creativity of Scots she applies by adding more direct and even literal sexual and physical references to enlarge the comic and the grotesque, e.g. in *Tartuffe*, she doubles the portion of food the religious man takes, Tartuffe asks Dorine to cover herself in the original, whereas Lochhead adds ‘to cover her breasts (whidjies)’; or applies ironic contrast: Orgon calls Tartuffe the ‘sowell’ [soul], whereas in the original the word is simply ‘man’ (Lochhead 2002, p. 129)

Verbal irony is central to the adaptation of *Educating Agnes* too. For instance, Arnolphe objects to the idea of an intelligent woman with the words: ‘no bluestocking bride for me’ but also uses politically correct language ‘not *challenged* in any way’ (*Educating Agnes*, p. 13). Lochhead’s Scots language in *Educating Agnes* comprises more metaphoric, idiomatic and modern forms of language, e.g. politically correct language (PC), in order to build the verbal masks of hypocrisy in the play. In the following example of characterisation of Arnolphe, Lochhead has tripled the irony:

ARNOLPHE: – Not *challenged* in any way,  
Not a *diva* nor a daftie or.... *lacking*, as we used to say.  
God! Take some beautiful brainbox, and, I tell you, I’d  
prefer  
Plain-as-a-scone and thick-as-a-plank to her! (*Educating Agnes*, p. 13)

In the above quote, firstly, as Debora Cameron in *Verbal Hygiene* claims, the very use of PC is ironic – ‘not challenged’, meaning with no defects, aiming at ideal wife image (Cameron 1995, p. 127). Secondly, the PC words have been italicised as well as the fashionable word ‘diva’ (silent irony) to which the old way of expressing the same meaning is given as ‘lacking’, also italicised. Thirdly, the dramatist uses the

power of poetic expressions to insert contrast as an ironic tool: ‘plain-as-a-scone and thick-as-a-plank’, i.e. compound and descriptive adjectives in visual contrast to the image of a simpleton, which in the original is more direct:

ARNOLPHE: - So much so that I should prefer a very stupid and ugly woman to a very beautiful one with a great deal of wit. (Stephen 2010, p. 2)

Politically correct language emerged from the counter-cultural movements of the Left and perhaps this could have triggered the idea to use it as a linguistic identity for Arnolphe, because of his newly changed class status, inserted also by the playwright in a comic way. In the original, Arnolphe trusts his friend and invites him to dinner in order to find out about his impression and opinion about his fiancée:

Arnolphe: ...To crown all, and as you are a trusty friend, I ask you to sup with her to-night. I wish you would examine her a little, and see if I am to be condemned for my choice. (Stephen 2010, p. 3)

Lochhead’s Arnolphe is more boastful. He invites Chrysalde with extreme self-confidence: ‘come... you’ll see/ how excellent my choice is.’ (Act I, p. 15). Such an arrogant and self-centred character bears resemblance to contemporary American cultural stereotypes. However, the new identity is not stable. Arnolphe finishes his speech with an old linguistic expression ‘No flies on me!’, which means ‘a quick, clever person, or a go-getter’(Act I, p. 14). Lochhead deliberately places the old-fashioned language in the mouth of Arnolphe, with the aim of revealing the constructed new social mask of linguistic hypocrisy, by reinscribing/resignifying the new language on the old linguistic paradigm. The interpretation of such a reading of the male cultural identity by the dramatist could be a reference about the changing status of language and its gradual politicisation in the framework, suggested by Robin Lakoff, and the socio-linguistic discourse discussed in the previous chapter as ‘language war’:

The struggle over hate speech and PC was the opening battle of the language war. (2000, p. 117)

The playwright also uses the figure of Arnolphe to mock at the misinterpreted politicisation of language and the deception created by a sense of power. His status of a phallic body is in constant threat by the feminine or the female body of Agnes as an object of desire. As already discussed in Chapter Four, the neo-liberal politics of

individualism support the view about the exclusion of passion and human emotions wrongly prescribed to the female bodies.

In addition to the mixture of old and modern language expressions, Lochhead makes use of compound adjectives to express the pretentiousness, both visually and aurally, of Arnolphe and turn him into a victim of the new fashion: 'Taking-a-little, trying-to-sound-posh, new-fangled fashion...' (Act I, p. 16). Chrysalde mocks at Arnolphe's 'carry-on' with the whole business of change of name as all his life he has been a middle class man with established social positions:

CHRYSLALDE: But all your life long, you've been Arnolphe!  
You're Arnolphe at the Rotary, Arnolphe at the Golf,  
At the *Kirk*, at the *Lodge* – you were Arnolphe at the school! (Act I, p. 16)

The enlisted memberships at the Rotary and Golf refer to wealthy class status, as do his affiliations with the religious establishment of the Scottish community, such as the Presbyterian church, known as the Kirk. The word, apart from being capitalised, is also italicised in order to ironise strong religious beliefs and suggest the still present Calvinistic attitude towards female sexuality, constantly attacked by the character of Agnes. Additionally, Arnolphe has connections with the Lodge, which is again ironically placed (in italics) by Lochhead in order to satirise the 'high' moral standards of life he supports as a member of the secular fraternal society of the Free Masons in Scotland. Lochhead gradually deconstructs the character of Arnolphe through sarcastic depiction of the three main principles of the Lodge and the overarching Calvinistic religious background plausible below the unstable, fashionable face painting. For instance, the first principle of freemasonry is brotherly love or respect and understanding for the opinions of others, which is present in the original:

ARNOLPHE: (*alone*). He is a little touched on certain points. Strange, to see how each man is passionately fond of his own opinion. (*Knocks at his door*)  
Hulloa! (Stephen 2010, p. 3)

Lochhead reverses this in order to show Arnolphe's selfishness and intolerance:

ARNOLPHE: He's some Chrysalde! He is too much!  
Very opinionated, not a man for listening!  
Helluva sure he's in the right 'bout everything.  
Haw! HAW! (*Educating Agnes*, p. 17)

This image is further expanded with the self-pleasing remark about the change of Arnolphe's name (without a rational explanation) into 'de la Touché' as ear-pleasing 'mellifluous' (vanity), which in the original sarcastically refers to an 'old rotten tree in the farm' (Stephen 2010, p.3).

Lochhead also re-inscribes the original with ironic insertions (not present in the original) as a pre-history based on linguistic contrast, e.g. the British 'bloody hard' is opposed to the Scottish 'scoosh' (very easy) to increase the sarcasm:

ARNOLPHE: I've worked hard all my life, Chrysalde, and every bean  
I've got  
Has been hard-earn by my own hard work, the lot!  
It was hard, bloody hard – oh, but it was a scoosh  
To change my name last year by deed poll to de la Touche.  
(Act I, p. 16)

The 'Deed Poll' is the UK service for change of names by post, which is one of the contemporary references Lochhead introduces into the text. The contrast between Britain and Scotland is a sardonic comment about the post-devolution cultural transformation: the difficulty of building a name and reputation in Britain and the easiness with which you can change it in Scotland.

There are not many bridges that connect the Scottish context to the seventeenth-century French context. One of the most evident similarities is indirect satire applied for the creation of contemporary social images. The dilapidated social images in the dramatic types on stage in classical France were created in order to make the audience recognise contemporary political and social characteristics but not the real/original behind the mask. Larry Norman claims that direct satire in French society then was indecorous and even illegal (Norman 2010, p. 105). Norman compares the ways the images are constructed to the concept of dual mirror reflection: social and theatrical ones as a game of reflection exchange in which very often the identities are blurred or misrecognised:

The playwright's dilemma was that he must keep the portrait specific enough to delight audiences by satirizing their contemporaries yet without making them realize that they themselves may be targeted. (Norman 2010, p. 7)

The portraiture of real models was a novelty which corresponded to the shift in aesthetics in art, namely, the portrait painting in the seventeenth century (a possible source of inspiration for the stage design by McLaren who placed a seductive picture of a woman from the period in the set). It also produced an impact on comedy writing, offering a post-Aristotelian framework of interpretation, applied as examples by Racine and Corneille (painting humans as they are and painting them better than they are). The main focus of French theatre at that time was social masks and mirrors of the French court, which in the view of Fischer-Lichte (2002), dictated the court relationships, i.e. ‘creating oneself anew as a social body, who wears a social mask’ (p. 102). Lochhead keeps these ideas conceptually but constructs them differently: the social/political masks are built with the help of Scots, old and new courtship systems and the influences of the new American neo-liberal culture and language. Molière is more radical – he equates comedy to verity (*vrai*) rather than verisimilitude (*vraisemblance*) (Norman 2010, pp. 41-42). Thus, the audience would experience a kind of confusion between the world of the play and their own reality. The philosophical underpinning of identity in the age served as an immaterial fourth wall, i.e. ‘to match a depiction to a concept of oneself’ (Norman 2010, p. 122). The depiction the audiences were exposed to did not contain moral profit, which according to Norman was achieved in three ways:

- (1) vanity at the moment of recognition, a narcissistic pleasure in seeing one’s faults,
- (2) misrecognition, seeing another in the portrait of oneself and believing that ‘one does not resemble the portrait’,
- (3) painful recognition, the shunning of the comic mirror, the inability to ‘stand to see [one’s] character on stage’. (2010, p. 125)

The dynamic relationship between depiction/representation and mis/recognition created most of the dramatic tension in the plays which barred the application of the comedy convention of New Comedy – a *dénouement* featuring a marriage or recognition (ibid. p. 157). This major issue of comedy revolution is elaborately discussed in *La Critique de l'Ecole des Femmes* (1663), the work which followed *L'Ecole des Femmes* and openly defended the position of the playwright. Molière’s distrust of the dominant comedy theory resulted in the creation of characters who

possessed not only general characteristics<sup>xviii</sup>, but universal and particular characteristics of his times, which in its essence was a reinserted concept from Old Comedy – the practice of mocking at recognisable contemporary figures (Calder 1993, p. 16). The new comedy Molière developed was based on French farce and was influenced by the Italian and Spanish traditional comical forms. Fischer-Lichte claims that Molière's comic mirrors of social relationships are caricatures containing a strong polemic element and 'any empathy the audience may feel is continually dissolved' (2002, p. 105).

The Scottish satire, which Lochhead's version offers, is more political and is very often characterised as self-satire in the Scottish cultural context. The self-satirical images, similarly to the double mirrored satire of Molière, are dilapidated, deformed and caricatured as the reviewer in *TVbomb* remarks:

When Molière was writing, farce was used to criticise the bourgeois by parodying them. Liz Lochhead's translation of Molière's *L'école des Femmes* (*School for Wives*) discards our reservations and inhibitions by making us laugh at ourselves. And it works. (*TVbomb* 2008)

Scottish satire has been founded not only in the tradition of religious hypocrisy but of religious bigotry in *Tartuffe*, which confirms a familiar Scottish focus for Molière's interests in social climbing in the name of religion, and in social climbing generally (Stevenson 2004, p. 108). The idea is reinforced in the ending which Lochhead alters from Molière's *rex-ex-machina* and its long speeches lauding monarchical power, to the parody of the aloof, omnipotent but rather unspecific figure of 'Mr Prince' (Stevenson 2004, p. 108). This social climbing ambition is further emphasised by the character of Arnolphe and his new image of Mister de la Touché ('Souche' in the original) in *Educating Agnes*.

Lochhead's position on the question of Molière's characterisation is very close to the stand of modern critics – she criticises the idea of the 'honette hommes' as prudish and narrow-minded. In the foreword to *Miseryguts* (2002), the playwright openly discusses Molière's characters as 'unique eccentrics', whose commedia stock masks could be seen underneath (Lochhead 2002, p. x). According to her, every character is

both a perfect type and a unique and ‘live-kicking’ human being with peculiar obsessions based on the deepest fears in their hearts. Among those universal human types, there are usually trickster con-man figures, who are not comic due to their conscious behaviour and the choices they make (e.g. Dorine in *Tartuffe*). Lochhead turns Georgette into a copy of Dorine and Celia into a trickster con-man figure who, due to the complexity of the plot and the number of relationships developing, is left somehow unnoticed by the audience because of her silence (*viz Edinburgh Guide* review).

The sharpened characteristics of the male and female characters due to their use of demotic language and increased physicality contribute to their grotesque representations and even strips them back to their commedia origins. Lochhead again uses sex difference as a point of discussion of the national identity question in Scotland and turns female characters again into the stronger sex similarly to the already discussed adaptations in Chapter Four. The story is narrated in the voice of the trickster con-man figure of Georgette, and Agnes is performed as a cultural outsider who disrupts the established masculine symbolic order, the way poetic language in Kristeva’s study threatens the phallic cultural narrative.

Varty defines Lochhead’s style as distinctive because of the verbal and physical ironies it speaks (1993, p. 166). In the critic’s opinion, Lochhead’s early training in the visual arts is reflected in the stage directions which often refer to painters or films to evoke the stage image (e.g. *Blood and Ice* and *Mary Queen of Scots Got Her Head Chopped Off*). In the same fashion, she let poetic language does the dramatic work for her in her early work, which she gradually managed to discard and replace with non-verbal stage craft:

...increased skilled use of the many dimensions of dramatic space and time, together with various devices to indicate multiple or split selves, confirm the ironic tone so often achieved by the dialogue. (Varty 1993, p. 167)

In *Tartuffe*, all female characters (Dorine, Marianne, Elmire) are compliant and pantomime to each other behind the back of Parnelle who, according to the characterisation presented by Lochhead, epitomises the old culture of kirkishness and



religious bigotry (Lochhead 2002, p. 129). Stevenson calls this tendency of increased pantomime in Lochhead's adaptation of Molière accentuation on the improvisation by stereotyped characters around standard plots, i.e. drawing upon the *commedia dell'arte* plots and characters in the foundations of Molière's texts and satire, which favoured social criticism of the 1980s. In the view of the same critic, Lochhead was one of the playwrights to give voice to a sceptical opinion on the Tory government (Stevenson 2004, p. 109).

Lochhead introduces bigger physicality in her new versions of Molière's plays too. The profuse use of gags and slapstick in the scenes between Arnolphe and his servants, brings the characterisation back to the stock *commedia dell'arte zanni*. In Molière, Georgette is a simple wife of Alain, and of the two Alain is the more proactive and witty. Lochhead has reversed the relationship and given prominence and female cunningness to Georgette who, in her strong relationship with the audience and meta-textual presence, resembles the stock *commedia dell'arte* character of Columbina. Columbina is the *inamorata's* servant – a bright and witty *zagna*, married to Arlecchino. She is a spectator herself and has a very strong relationship with the audience. In Lochhead's revision, Georgette is Agnes' confidante and main educator. Alain is the simpleton, described as 'very, very thick' (Act I, p. 17). In the foreword, Lochhead admits she made Georgette close to the character of Dorine and Toinette (Act I, p. 6), which is similar to the *soubrette*<sup>xix</sup> – another type in classical French theatre at the time.

Male Scottish characters are characterised by increased selfishness and foolishness due to greediness, extreme focus on self-interest and appropriated deceptive self-images of political authority and centres of human knowledge, similarly to the male characterisation in the Greek adaptation by the playwright. For example, consider Chrysalde's final words in the last scene referring to his friend's plan: 'I should say: stinks of self-interest' (Act V, p. 80). The selfishness and pettiness bring the character of Arnolphe closer to the stock character of Pantalone – the rich, old fool in which the father figure and the old rich fiancé fuse. Pantalone is usually mean to his servants, narrow-mindedly proscriptive with his children, and indulgent to himself –

as he appears in the very beginning in the description provided by the playwright in the opening scene: ‘cocky and superior’ (*Educating Agnes*, p. 11). However, his main virtue is transparency: his motives are so obvious that he emerges almost as an honest man. Pantalone operates on the assumption that everything can be bought and sold, and this turns out to be true, with the exception of loyalty and love. Certainly, Arnolphe sees himself as a good Christian for taking over the guardianship of Agnes (saving a soul) and by lending money to Horace. Arnolphe’s vanity and love for money and power is further enforced by the clarification about his decision to marry he gives to Chrysalde: ‘I’m well off/ so I don’t need to marry for money but for ... love/ you could say, not to get too flowery, ha-ha!’ (Act I, p. 14).

One of the most conspicuous signs of vanity and hypocrisy is the change in the family name of Arnolphe to Mister de la Touché (‘Souche’ – strain, Breton origin, in the original). The change to ‘Touché’ by Lochhead has other implications – to acknowledge an unsuccessful point in a debate or a witty retort along with the fencing term for a defeat. Ironically, nobody in the play addresses him by his new name but constantly calls him by his old name, thus indicating that the change is a superficial adoption of new identity, pretty much pretentious. Arnolphe’s double face resembles to a certain extent that of Tartuffe and his pretended piety. Lochhead does not miss the opportunity to mock Arnolphe’s striving for ‘Christian goodness’ through the characters of the young lovers (inamorati), suggesting the religious hang-ups of the Scottish about sexuality and women. The desire for new identity is dictated by the political change and the pro-American trend in the contemporary Scottish society.

Molière’s female types are defined as: worldly wife, sophisticated cocotte, ingénue, free spirit, prude (Lochhead 2002, p. xi). Lochhead’s female characters cannot be characterised with a single prototype like these, in the same way that, Arnolphe cannot be identified solely as a Pantalone mask. He also performs aspects of the Dottore mask, in particular during the scene of the marriage rules reading. Agnes is not only the ingénue type but also reveals traits of the worldly wife. In a similar way, Celia from *Miseryguts* is not only the sophisticated cocotte, but the free spirit too. Such characterisation technique refers back to Lochhead’s perception of Molière’s

characters as a dichotomous unity between a type and a unique human being, which in itself introduces an ironic gap. Further irony in the play is achieved through gender subversion, which is an old technique applied by the playwright, and a clash between subtexts, resulting in further expansion of the dramaturgical space of the work. Lochhead skilfully inserts meta-theatrical lines/comments through the female characters of Agnes and Georgette in scenes such as the first meeting between Agnes and Arnolphe. Such re-inscribing techniques are not new to the playwright. Mugglestone argues that Lochhead was, along with issues of class and nation, very strongly interested in the notion of 'femaleness', and defined it in her work as 'Scottish, female, working class, contemporary identity' (Mugglestone 1993, p. 102). According to the same critic, Dorine is one of the strongest character of femaleness in the understanding of the playwright, which after the adaptation of *Educating Agnes*, could be rivalled with the character of Georgette. She is assertive, outspoken, defiant, taking the last word in the play. The character of Agnes has also very strong features compared to its French prototype and projects a contemporary identity of sexual exploitation, which no longer corresponds to the working class woman identity. Georgette as a representative of this old female construct, passes all her knowledge and womanly skills to Agnes in order to help her escape the oppressive advances of her uncle. Agnes is inserted as a post-colonial female body and source of a political voice about the marginalisation of women by the new phallic culture. In terms of genre, the farcical structure of the play is intensified by the application of race difference as a theme for colonisation. As a result, all male characters are depicted as caricatures, or as Gilbert & Tompkins claim: the grotesque features of the coloniser suggest a status of colonisation.

Ian McDonald and Jenny Harvie see Lochhead as the provocateur, who encourages the audience to rethink how 'women and femininity' are constructed, as a product of political ideologies and choices (Harvie & McDonald 1993, p. 136). In the opinion of the same critics, Lochhead introduces the discourse of female representations through the application of alienation devices, one of the most prominent being irony and metatextuality, in order to show that 'power lies not with the subject of

representation, but with who controls that representation' (Harvie & McDonald 1993, p. 139).

The asymmetry of power is represented through sex difference by Lochhead, which also leads to the distortion of the images of male characters as carriers of cultural identity. For Molière, this patriarchal order was established on the basis of hypocrisy and artificial politeness (manners) which led to further incarceration of women in his society. Molière discovered that it was not the actual lock on the door that kept the woman imprisoned in her house, but that she continued to be imprisoned by the social code she had accepted as natural law (Scolnicov 1994, pp. 88-89). Lochhead manages to comment on this by forging a dialogue between two different systems of instructing women in order to reveal the clash in the points Arnolphe supports and the way asymmetry is socially constructed. The newly established gentleman is nothing more than the old Arnolphe who has embraced new fashions and courtship in order to re-assert his status and power. Perhaps, Lochhead also argues that the established change of the modernised Scottish society is very thin; beneath it the old beliefs and perceptions about women and their objectification are still powerful. Seen from the perspective of the new national model in Scotland after Devolution, it is a 'new' attempt at a dual identity appropriation as a claim for political equality. The new fashions originate from the American culture and proclaim neo-liberal politics. The same coloniser and social masks are further deconstructed in the adaptation of *Three Sisters* analysed in Chapter Six.

In the original play *L'Ecole des Femmes*, Agnes obediently reads the first ten maxims and is interrupted by Arnolphe didactically, who asserts his authority by promising to explain the meaning of the maxims later (Stephen 2010, pp. 18-19). Lochhead's Arnolphe is tyrannical (demonstrating intellectual dominance), preaching and self-indulgent. He 'authoritatively' explains the first maxim after which Agnes cunningly slips away with the excuse of a little migraine (a modern female identity characteristic). Lochhead gradually deconstructs the Kirk allegiance in this scene which reveals social inequality to be a cultural norm, and the principles of fidelity, 'the bedrock of marriage', and obedience, showing 'all respect and gratitude' to the husband, as the building blocks of female identity or the social

image of the wife. She has not only to be but also to be seen too to be ‘*faithful*’ and ‘*obedient*’ in order to deserve her master’s/husband’s ‘protection and trust’(Act III, Scene 3, pp. 46-47). The accent on ‘seen’ female virtues of faithfulness and obedience positions Arnolphe as selfishly caring about his social reputation but it also accentuates the social hypocrisy he is enslaved to and the extremes to which he has gone in embracing modern fashions in order to improve his social and financial status. Lochhead shows this through the ‘blurb’ which Agnes reads. The book is a self-teaching guide for young women who want to marry wealthy men and keep them (*Educating Agnes*, p. 48). Arnolphe’s act of silencing Agnes through the phallic language of social norms of visual propriety is interrupted with a deliberately played ‘inability’ of pronouncing the word ‘infidelity’ by his young fiancée. Arnolphe’s ego is further reasserted with a zoomed air of authority:

From Kinsey to Cosmo, behaviourologists say, in no  
Uncertain terms:  
The so-called Open Marriage is a Can of Worms (Act III, p. 49)

The authoritative knowledge of Arnolphe is ironically based on readings of popular culture magazines. Furthermore, his impatience and lack of sound rational explanation reveal feminine traits of a so-called ‘psychological instability’. Arnolphe patronisingly finishes his speech with the promise to explain all when they are married and says in an American lingo format:

Stick to your husband! Have no truck  
With looking elsewhere – No Young Bucks,  
That’s Rule One in a nutshell!  
(Act III, p. 49)

In *Verbal Hygiene*, Cameron argues that the stereotypical norms of linguistic femininity such as silence, deference and unassertiveness are not ancient but modern and bourgeois in origin:

‘the court lady was required to speak; the bourgeois wife was enjoined to silence’; a lady-in-waiting at a European royal court was expected to engage in witty, public talk, often in mixed company and often on the sexually-charged subject of love. (Cameron 1995, p. 174)

The second contemporary comment introduced by Lochhead is rooted in the self-help movement which is historically ‘an offshoot of American pragmatism, and of a

much older tradition of “conduct literature” which can be traced back to medieval Europe (Cameron 1995, p. 173).

Cameron explains how the asymmetry is demonstrated:

the male and female spheres are not equal, the obligations they impose are not reciprocal and the kinds of authority men and women have in their respective spheres are not parallel. Ultimately it is men who have power (in public and private life) whereas women have only responsibility. But in a genre that is *itself* divided between public (career advice) and private (relationship advice), it is virtually impossible to address this asymmetry. (Cameron 1995, p. 198)

Cameron’s remark about the self-divided genre into public and private could be applied to the interpretation of the characterisation of Celia, another trickster con-man figure from *Miseryguts*, whose colonised status is not visible and whose sexual exploitation is not questioned. Her invisibility comes from the dual role she performs: of the satirised colonised body along with Alex, and of the trickster figure who is not funny but is also not sympathetic until the very end of the play.

The social code of imprisonment is revisited by Lochhead in the new cultural light of political imprisonment – colonisation and sexual exploitation of women. Agnes is not only an orphan but has been bought by Arnolphe from a country wife and brought up by nuns in ‘purity’, which is nothing but mental and sexual ignorance. Further to the feminist political debate, as in previous adaptations, Lochhead’s play problematises the notion of female representation. As Kristeva in *Desire in Language* (1980) argues, male culture has a reductionist perception of women so that woman’s identity is equated solely to the social role of the biological mother/ cultural reproduction. Moreover, as mentioned in the previous chapter, Shane Phelan argues that the liberal politics see the male body as the phallic, thus leaving the female body weak in body and mind (Phelan 1999, pp. 59-60). However, being a phallic subject creates a state of constant anxiety about maintaining the power as there is a palpable threat of being overcome by that which it excludes (Phelan 1999, pp. 59-60). Therefore, Arnolphe’s anxiety is explainable and he constantly reasserts himself as the phallic body verbally, with sexist remarks, e.g. (inserted by Lochhead) the expressed opinion about women:

... Makes you laugh to think an ... *emotional incontinent*  
Is what Women Think They Want!...

(Act III, p. 50)

This implies the clichéd generalised male perception that women usually do not know what they want. Lochhead inserts more of the general socio-linguistic traits of female identity discussed by Robin Lakoff, namely: women use more apologetic language than men – in Lochhead’s version Agnes starts but corrects herself:

AGNES: Stop! Uncle, these are *your* feelings Fine.  
But they are – you embarrass me – no business of mine.  
I’m sorry – no, I’m *not* sorry. You don’t move  
Me at all. It’s Horace I love. (Act V, p. 76)

The use of silent/graphic rhymes introduces further implications for the colonised status of the subject. As Lakoff argues in her seminal work in 1975 *Language and Woman’s Place*, it is a general assumption that women speak less frequently (Meyerhoff/ Lakoff 1975). The words in italics work as emphasis to the meaning the words carry. In contrast to the original text, the lack of connection between the *loco parentis* and the young woman is intensified in contrast to the strong connection of Agnes and Horace: ‘Stay. All you say does not touch my heart. Horace could do more with a couple of words’ (Stephen 2010, p. 34). In Lochhead’s play, Agnes is more openly communicative about her love to the young man and acts with stronger self consciousness about love relationships and feelings.

In the list provided by Lakoff, there is also the assumption that women use more apologetic language and lack a sense of humour, ironised by Lochhead through the protagonist Agnes:

AGNES: Uncle, are you teasing? See, I seem to lack  
What they call a Sense of Humour? I never know  
When someone’s joking. If you are, please tell me so (Act II, p. 42)

The power structure is challenged by the protagonist by the disruptive behaviour of female sexuality. Arnolphe’s character in Lochhead is more emotionally unstable and easily driven into rage than in the original, therefore the way he regains power is through the use of hate speech, which also marks a loss of temper: ‘Arnolphe: Why don’t you love me/ You ungrateful bitch! (Act V, p. 79). The same part of the scene in the original is spoken in a more sarcastic tone: ‘Arnolphe: Why not love me, Madam Impudence?’ (Stephen, p. 33). As already discussed in the previous chapter,

the application of hate speech by the phallic body is an act of abjection of the feminine in the theoretical study of Kristeva.

Additionally, Lochhead uses profanity (viewed as American cultural influence) in *Educating Agnes I*. This is repeated in the development of the character of the protagonist Alex in *Miseryguts*. For example, in Act III Molière's Arnolphe is thinking rationally:

Arnolphe: – (*aside*). A certain Greek told the Emperor Augustus, as an axiom as useful as it was true, that when any accident puts us in a rage, we should, first of all repeat the alphabet; ... so that the suspicions of my disordered mind may cunningly lead her to the topic, and, by sounding her heart, gently find out the truth. (Stephen 2010)

In Lochhead, Arnolphe resorts to a self-help technique of reciting the alphabet and nine times the table:

ARNOLPHE *has achieved an an om-like state of calmness*  
ARNOLPHE: A certain Greek told the Emperor August... (Act II, p. 33)

Lochhead delights in depicting the scene of disturbance by the semiotic in which Arnolphe is driven to a state of extreme anger. In the following example, Lochhead applies in a contemporary fashion capital letters in order to visually signify the raised and agitated voice of the protagonist:

ARNOLPHE: WHERE DID HE KISS YOU? (Act II, p. 38)

Agnes's answers are even more ridiculous, as she is plausibly playing with her uncle's perceptions of her as the ignorant simpleton drowned in sweet innocence:

AGNES: In my chamber, didn't I  
Explain?  
Do we really have to go through all that again? (Act II, p. 38)

Such verbal choices help Lochhead deliberately lengthen the scenes of disturbance in order to prolong the agony of the phallic body. Such are the scenes in which Agnes describes the kisses and moments of physical closeness with her young lover:

ARNOLPHE: Be patient with her. Aaah... Anges... Sweetness,  
Where exactly... on your person... did he kiss?

AGNES: Silly-Billy! Going to make me blush but you don't care! (Act II, p. 39)



Seen through the post-colonial drama theory of Gilbert and Tompkins, the Scottish adaptation of Molière by Lochhead creates a language of cultural resistance through visual and verbal body politics (2002, p. 203). Lochhead distorts Arnolphe's character to the point where it becomes a grotesque image, which, according to the same critics, could be interpreted as a body marked by imperialism which suggests a colonised status of a coloniser (Gilbert & Tompkins. pp. 224-225). Furthermore, the corporeal presence of Agnes is revealed textually through a zoomed focus on her sexuality and the matter of chastity, a subject of concern for Arnolphe, and performatively via her silence both verbally and visually shown on stage in the 2008 production by *theatre babel*.

Of all three types of silence Gilbert and Tompkins (2002, p. 190) derive from the feminist criticism of Elaine Showalter, *inaudibility* and *muteness* are the ones that can be found in the original text – the character speaks more non-verbally than through words and is silenced by Arnolphe when she tries to explain and express her feelings for Horace. Lochhead introduces the third type of silence, namely that of *refusal to speak*/read the book of marriage rules as a means of resistance to the authoritarian male power of her uncle. In the view of Gilbert and Tompkins, this builds a counter discourse in which the subject refuses 'to be interpolated as the linguistic subject in the master narrative' (2002, p. 190). Agnes's speech/act repeats the one delivered by Medea as a melancholic body gaining consciousness and power over the dominant narrative and, at the same time, freeing itself from that narrative (2002, p. 140).

Additionally, in the performance by *theatre babel*, Agnes is played by a black actress which immediately politicises the subject, or as Gilbert describes it:

The ways in which the reinscription and self-representation colonised bodies translate into performative strategies is a key issue for post-colonial theatre. (Gilbert & Thompkins 2002, p. 204)

Those colonially determined inscriptions are often deconstructed through representations of gender and race. The western culture construct of the female body

is a passive and looked-at object, hence if a racially different corporeal presence is shown, it is expected to be *overlooked* (Gilbert & Tompkins apply both senses of the word – to stay invisible and to be stared at and fully examined) (2002. p. 207). Anglo-American feminists are concerned mostly with demarcating ‘areas of women’s subjugation under imperialism’ which is also the main task of Lochhead with her version of the play (2002, p. 213).

The voice/silence is further constructed through the exploitation of Scots. Similarly to her previous adaptations, Lochhead applies a variety of registers (English, Scottish English, Scots) to establish the social context inclusive of class and gender differences. Scottish society has been assigned the metaphorical image of the provincial town in which the clear distinction between the masters’ and servants’ classes is established linguistically through the use of a variety of registers. Arnolphe and Chrysalde are the two gentlemen who shift between English and Scottish English, and similarly to the ruling class members in *Medea* (2000) share the same traits of hypocrisy and cynicism. As with Kreon, the change of registers of the two gentlemen in *Educating Agnes* occurs concurrently with changes in the emotional state: the more passionate and less rational, the more of the Scots register is spoken, and vice versa. Register shift is also a tool to satirise and delineate social hierarchy in the case of Arnolphe who speaks Scots English and English with his servants, English/ Scottish English with his friend Chrysalde and English with Agnes, Horace and Orante.

Arnolphe sees Agnes as a sweet, innocent and pure child:

ARNOLPHE: ... I had an apprentice  
Affection for my wee lamb Agnes, even then.  
Wee doll, so she was, at nine or ten!  
But the wee soul ....  
Her innocent wee heart with childish pleasure  
... my innocent wee pet’s almost *eighteen*! (Act I, pp. 14–15)

He also considers her emotions childish and scolds her as if she were a child:

ARNOLPHE: Never again take sweets, or anything else, from any stranger...  
(Act III, p. 45)

Here Agnes is the objectivised image of Mary in *MQS*, according to the Calvinist perception about women still dominant in contemporary cultural interpretations. The audience and Horace witness the second face of Agnes, of a more ecstatic and sexual body, which is presented by Lochhead as a rational young woman. Her awakening about her own oppressed status is revealed in a direct accusation at her uncle:

AGNES: on the surface, dear Uncle, you couldn't do enough.  
But in fact you went to great trouble and expense  
to keep me in, what you could call, Darkest Innocence  
... I'm ashamed of my ignorance. (Act V, pp. 74–75)

The subtle religious theme introduced by Lochhead is further developed in the symbolism of the character of Agnes. In a few places, Arnolphe refers to Agnes as the lamb, which is the symbolic image of St. Agnes, martyred by the Catholic Church for her chastity (virginity and purity). So, apart from the father and husband figure, Arnolphe attempts at playing the god father figure, who could mould: 'the Absolutely Ideal Wife/ to warm, cherish and make me happy all my life' (Act III, p. 49). This sweet and obedient soul is brought up in a convent school by nuns: 'to be loving and obedient, not fool/ but sweet and *very* grateful'. Only eighteen, she is locked away in a neighbouring house, for propriety, and looked after by two servants who are 'as daft as hersel' (Act I, p. 15). The Ideal Wife according to the old man is not a very demanding role: 'not *challenged* in any way' but simple and 's'enough if she can love *me* – and Jesus! – and can sew/ and knit' (Act I, p. 13).

According to Riggs, Arnolphe is Molière's criticism of the established image of modern individualism, which 'clearly and systematically represents the fear of and desire to control woman and emotion', hence the protective measure for obedience and faithfulness driven to obsession (Riggs 2005, p. 42). Lochhead goes beyond this modernist symbolic meaning in her discussion of female identity in the play. She bases the argument on the subtle grounds of religious perception of women and society as a product of neo-liberal politics in which the theme of individualism takes grotesque shape. Fear of the feminine is also layered with the inability of the phallic body to overcome the constant threat of human passion and emotions which are automatically projected onto the weak in body and mind female. This is represented

symbolically by Kristeva by the image of the melancholic. It is also close to the image of the Christian saint (or the Virgin Mary), through obedience to the law of the father enters the male space as a sexless body. The conflict and frustration which Arnolphe experiences are depicted by the assertion of the female body as sexual and the sensations of sexual pleasure (moments of *jouissance*) are portrayed as tormenting and disturbing. The suffering of Arnolphe is prolonged and ultimate – he has a double loss: that of his future wife and adopted daughter. At the beginning of the play, the ‘heartbreakingly young, very sweet, very pretty’ (Act I, p. 21) Agnes is the silenced, colonised female body, who performs resistance not through language but through disruptive and comical body language typical of the *lazzi*. The more verbal Agnes becomes, the more conscious of her suppressed situation she is, and the more disobedient. The language war culminates in a moment when Arnolphe openly admits his lack of power:

There simply is no educating Agnes.  
She is a woman. The one I thought a child  
with a sweet nature, easy to mould.... Never.  
(Act V, p. 75)

In essence, similarly to her reading of the Greek adaptations, Lochhead infers that there is no resolution to the sex conflict. Furthermore, the sex war has been succeeded by a language war, which also lacks a sense of resolution for the national question of the Scottish.

The play has been staged twice – in 2008 by *theatre babel* in Glasgow and in 2011 by the Royal Lyceum Theatre in Edinburgh. The two performances differed enormously. Director Graham McLaren (2008) chose to present the post-colonial theme via the presence of a black actress, Anneika Rose, starring as Agnes. This theme was not visualised or specifically addressed by director Tony Cownie in 2011, however Nicola Ray, who starred as Agnes, shared in an article for *The Scotsman* that she felt Arnolphe’s character was very disturbing.

*The Stage* did not find the performance of *theatre babel* convincing. In their view, the cast was deliberately forcing the rhythm of the verse, often drawing attention to the rhymes for comic effect which decreased the audience’s trust in Lochhead’s

script and reduced the play to the level of comic recitation. *The Guardian* felt that the real star was the script, whereas Michael Cox (OnstageScotland.com) felt that at times the poetic prevailed over the dramatic, which distracted the actors from putting subtext to the words. As a result, they pronounced the text with unnecessary emphasis on the poetic meter.

Cownie's staging, in the view of *The Guardian*, came more effortlessly, cheeky, witty and linguistically playful than the laboured version of *theatre babel*. Joyce McMillan and Julia Carstairs (EdinburghSpotlight.com) praised the visual achievement of the Lyceum team – both for Lochhead's linguistically updated version inscribed over the preserved seventeenth-century setting in the text and the parallel narration in performance with authentic period town houses designed by Hayden Griffin, whose visual narrative was interspersed with the sudden appearance of modern props to increase the comedy.

*L'Ecole des Femmes* takes a place of major importance in the writing career of the playwright. It was his eighth play and first five-act comedy in verse which drifted away from the traditional farce and moved to a new form, which, for Lalande, bridged the gap between the classical comedic and tragic genres and rivalled the superiority of tragedy (Lalande, p. 165). Lochhead's version clearly stayed in the form of farce which she gradually pushes towards pantomime. Such a dramatic form was also followed by the first director of the play in 2008. McLaren kept the pantomime spirit as the blog writer at *View from the Stalls* shares:

Graham McLaren's direction also played a large part in my enjoying of the show as he keeps the overall tone well short of 'panto' territory, although I would have liked to have seen (or at least heard) representations of a couple of the 'off stage' moments. (*View from the Stalls* 2008)

The controversial play staging by *theatre babel* received very mixed responses. Firstly, the stage design and use of a painting as a visual layer to the story has been both praised by the reviewer Michael Cox for *OnStageScotland* and criticised by Thom Dibdin for *The Stage* (Dibdin 2008).

A similar disagreement could be seen in the reviewers' responses regarding the dialogue and its performance by *theatre babel*. For Cox, again, it is one of the strengths of the adaptation by Lochhead:

There is something delicious about watching two French aristocrats speak in posh terms and, out of frustration, break into Scots profanity. Indeed, it's a bit of a shame that Lochhead didn't push a bit more Scots into this version as the Scottish flavour proved to be the production's highlight. (Cox 2008)

For the untrained ear, though, the change of registers and specific rhyming of the playwright can present some difficulties at first. However, once tuned-in, one can relax and enjoy the experience (*View From the Stalls*). Mark Fisher for *The Guardian* considers McLaren's production laboured, while he sees Tony Cownie's revival as vigorous, cheeky and witty. However, for this critic, both productions failed to outshine the playtext. Cox admires the director's talents for creating funny visuals in inserting several post-modern moments (Cox 2011). However, Cox found the production's timing as a farcical play problematic.

Joyce McMillan, for *The Herald*, finds another flaw in the revival of the Scottish 'classic', namely the 'demolishing [of] Arnolphe's sexual attitudes in language', which leads to a superficial anachronism, since the mood and language tone strangely start matching the original (McMillan 2011). One of the missed contemporary references of the play is the renewed theme of sexual exploitation by 'the new internet age of sexual fantasy' (McMillan 2011).

In the modern transposition of *The Misanthrope* into *Miseryguts* in 2002, Lochhead again sets the action in Scotland. In this version, similarly to *Educating Agnes* and in contrast to *Tartuffe*, Lochhead removes the scene divisions in each act and replaces them with transitional stage directions which sometimes carry quite a substantial amount of the subtext of the play.

Each adaptation is approached differently by Lochhead – if *Tartuffe* is set loosely in 1920s Scotland, *Miseryguts* is a contemporary reading set in Edinburgh among media rats and politicians looking critically at art policy and country politics. *Educating Agnes* is left in the seventeenth century but the choice of linguistic forms

and expressions have been modernised in order to problematise the modernised Scottish culture and its inhibitions in terms of sexuality. In a way, since *Educating Agnes* was written and performed six years after *Miseryguts*, Lochhead brings the attention of the audience to the question of modern Scotland and its Calvinistic heritage with the central issue of women's invisibility on the cultural scene. The modern interpretation of *Le Misanthrope* focuses on other gender and social issues, again based on the question of female sexuality but approaching women in the public space. Alex's fixation on truth, similar to that of Oedipus in *Thebans*, is hypocritical and painfully self-destructive because it hides his anxiety about Celia's relationship with other men and his inability to trust her which constantly poisons their time together and pushes his love away.

The means of communications in Lochhead's adaptations are modern – mobile phones, telephone conversations and text messages; the love theme has been replaced by sex and gender issues, especially with Oscar's poems and his sexuality which is used as an identity mask and kind of a developing tool for the plot.

The roots of Alex's misanthropy are not so much the poisonous people but his self-destructive nature due to self-delusion, described by his friend Phil at the end of the play (an addition by Lochhead):

PHIL: ... I've wasted far too long already doing what I can  
To hinder the self destructive excesses of this man.  
(*Miseryguts*, p. 82)

In contrast, in the literal translation the last words are spoken by Philinte:

Come, Madam, let's do everything we can  
To change the mind of this unhappy man.  
(p. 168)

Similarly to her previous adaptations, Lochhead alters the ending and introduces a female perspective to the narration. In the case of *Miseryguts*, this is Celia, whose state of mind and personal agony at the end of the story are revealed solely through silence and stormy weeping in the stage directions (*Miseryguts*, p. 82). For her, Alex is a great love but also a prison due to his misanthropic character, best described as

the ‘drama queen’ in her life (*Miseryguts*, p. 62). This image is further reinforced by the words of his best friend Phil:

PHIL: Don’t you think you’re being a bit pervious? Al, please  
Don’t hotfoot it to the windswept bogs and trees  
on account of a storm in a teacup like this....  
(*Miseryguts*, p. 70)

When Alex finds out about the affair between Oscar and Celia, he overreacts, overusing comical synonyms for black to reveal his vain self-focus and need of attention:

ALEX: I’m too upset! I’m all churned up inside you know!  
I can’t just *socialize*! Go on, away you go  
And leave me with my black despair in this dark corner! –

PHIL: sit and feed your huffy wee black dog then, Mister Homer!  
....  
(*Miseryguts*, p. 72)

Similarly to Arnolphe in *Educating Agnes*, such open provocation leads the male interlocutor into a fit of rage, thus subverting the gender roles and presenting women as the stronger sex:

ALEX: Don’t jest! This is no laughing matter!  
Bitch! You should blush to the roots of your being.  
I’ve got proof of all those things I have been seeing  
All too clearly but telling myself that I was too wrong  
You’ve been cheating on me all along!  
(*Miseryguts*, p. 62)

This question of women’s infidelity, read as a sexual betrayal and as part of the feeling of betrayal from society and friends in general, is central to the character of Alex. He, similarly to Arnolphe, lives in a world of black and white and is very, very jealous (‘green jealous’ – Lochhead repeats an image in both texts). The above wording and perception of Celia’s behavior by Alex is driven to the absurd. The sexual betrayal, as in *Medea*, is part of the gendered national question debate and interpretation of the cultural betrayal from the introduced perspective of sex difference as a cultural divide. Therefore, the free sexual expression of women is morally branded by male society – although Celia is not married to either Oscar or Alex, she is cruelly judged and accused:

ALEX: and I demand it.



The truth from your own lips, Celia Mann!

....

You bitch. You've cheated on both of us.

(*Miseryguts*, p. 75)

Celia is more sensitive and smart and brings the matter to a solution through simple male bonding over a drink in a pub where men often decide that all women are bitches (*Miseryguts*, p. 75).

She interprets Alex's habit of objecting for the sake of objection as an air of strong self-importance:

CELIA: Alex Frew's obliged to be contrary.

If everyone says one thing, he doesn't care, eh?

He'll say the exact opposite. He will!

Automatically. As a matter of principle....

....

PHIL: You're a contrary bugger, but, it's true!

Nobody can say anything about anybody 'cept you.

(*Miseryguts*, pp. 35-36)

Celia continues to challenge Alex and her openness to other men is purely a strategy to provoke and possibly free him from blindness and selfishness. In the first scene of Act II, they have just had sex when two other friends come to their house. Celia lets them in against the protests of Alex. The phone rings and Alex is stuck in the bed naked realizing that he can not leave the bed and answer the phone. Celia plays a soft game with him:

CELIA: Come and get it.

*Through gritted teeth –*

ALEX: I'm stuck here naked!

CELIA: Woops! How could I forget it?

ALEX: Jesus, will you give me the bloody phone?

Instead of sitting giving it the Sharon Stone?

CELIA: Perhaps Clint'll pass you the cordless.

Say pretty please though, not a word less

(*Miseryguts*, p. 39)

Women's images are ambiguous; they have to use the phallic language of hatred in order to establish their social identities. Celia and Zoe, the second is the clype figure of the protagonist, mutually hammer each other with gossip and verbally attack each other. Celia is the 'free woman' figure, desired by all of the men in the play. Her status as a divorcee (widow in the original) makes her even more attractive to the men who like both her body and mind. Zoe is the feminist nationalist supporter whose alleged celibacy is a mere mask for political manoeuvring. Both women are not only serious political opponents but also experience a personal fight over Alex, who seems to be desired secretly by all of the women in the play. This blurring of the private with the public undermines the dominant national question and problematises gender difference as publicly accepted sexual inequality blatantly spoken by the character of Celia:

CELIA: ... we've both broken through the glass ceiling –  
Well, on the face of it, Zoe, we are well-matched.  
I'm still young and single and... well, you're unattached  
And we're both strong successful women who are upfront,  
Speak out 'bout things – so we're bound to bear the brunt  
Of the endemic institutionalised misogyny  
That is, God help us, *still* our lot today!...  
(*Miseryguts*, p. 49)

The feminist reading of the female characters in the play also supports the shared belief of the second wave of feminists that the personal is political.

Lochhead depicts two professionally successful and strong women who have managed to break through the glass ceiling of the public male hierarchy and gain more power. However, as Cameron claims about gender inequality, the power women gain is less than a male counterpart will gain, while the responsibilities are more (1995, p.198). From a personal point of view they both are single and by taking the role of public speakers for their own lot suffer from 'endemic institutionalized misogyny' (*Miseryguts*, p. 49). Lochhead does not miss the opportunity to verbalise this as women's fate in contemporary culture and in particular in Scotland.

The two characters mirror each other in a violent verbal battle (language war), which presents the existence of women in the public sphere as still problematic, similarly to the treatment of the subject in the Calvinistic perceptions about the two queens in *MQS* with sexuality still the main marker of femininity. In this adaptation, the

character of Celia is very close to that of Medea and is punished by the phallic culture, hence her social silencing at the end.

Their single status is perceived as problematised femininity of the characters: Zoe is the prudish, 'anti-sex' woman who lacks a sense of humour, which is a sexist view according to Lakoff's study of Language and Woman's Place. Zoe's corresponds to the character of Elizabeth in *MQS*, whereas Celia is seen as the other extreme: the sexually promiscuous female body similar to the image of Mary in the *MQS* model (*Miseryguts*, pp. 48-49). Both characters also use strong/profane language. As Lakoff remarks women in professional life are forced to use 'strong language' in order to be taken seriously at their work places (Lakoff, p. 237). Lochhead mixes the professional with personal (again blurring the public and private sphere) by making both characters attack their opponent in a very feminine fashion:

CELIA: ...  
They say you've no style, dress as though you hate  
Yourself....  
(*Miseryguts*, p. 49)

ZOE: ....  
Your journalistic skills were strictly 'wot-scorcher'  
'Street-of-Fear'-type clichéd tabloid dreck.  
- but, you had a flautable ass and a brass neck...  
(*Miseryguts*, p. 48)

The argument develops into a fierce debate about both women's beliefs about feminism. Zoe is a supporter of the second wave of feminism which fights for equality between the sexes; her opponent is supporter of the new generation of feminists who challenge the 'equality vs. difference' concept, celebrate sexuality as a positive aspect of life and plead for female individualism. Lochhead presents this feminist debate as unresolved by providing sound critique of both feminist trends through the voices of the female cast: the attempt of the second wave feminists to assert equality has proved futile because women stayed trapped in the dominant male frame of power and language:

CELIA: I'm sorry! *Effort to get men to what?*  
I must have it all wrong. I thought  
Feminism was about fighting the good fight  
For the assertion of *female* values and our right  
To validate *ourselves* and have autonomy.

But it's about what men think of us, I see!  
(*Miseryguts*, p. 51)

The other trap Zoe sees in her opponent's beliefs is that sexually free women repeat the sexual abuse men used to treat women with and she sees it as a threat of losing female identity:

ZOE: Treat men as sexual objects! That's very liberated!...  
When women use men, we should equally condemn  
The kind of sexual voraciousness we deplored in them.  
(*Miseryguts*, pp. 51–52)

Reviewer Elizabeth Mahoney for *The Guardian* observes that Lochhead is: 'dealing with friendships, judgment, and the free woman vs. new woman (who is she anyway?)' (Mahoney 2002). However, at the heart of this argument is not a sole interest in finding a political resolution to the question of female identity and modern feminist developments but an ironic view of the women in power using profane/strong language in order to deal with personal problems of sexuality fired up by mutual attraction to a male character. The means of characterisation Lochhead applies in this adaptation is curious as she uses it to introduce subtly class and class frictions in contemporary Scotland through the feminist ideologies of second and third wave feminism.

Second wave feminist speakers generally belonged to the upper-middle class white race. They believed in the inequality of the sexes and struggled to establish social equality and rights. The supporters of the second wave of feminism, active between the 1960s and the 1980s, believed in the existence of a universal female identity. In contrast, the third wave feminists included a wide range of women from diverse racial origins and class, with central place being given to black women. The movement is not homogeneous; it incorporates a number of beliefs and theories, inclusive of post-colonialism. Third-wave feminism emerged in the 1990s and its foundational conceptual framework followed the ideas of post-structuralist interpretation of gender and sexuality based on the notion of difference rather than equality, and presented female identity as linguistically constructed as a guarantee of power hierarchy preservation by the phallic culture.

Such an interpretation by the playwright introduces Celia indirectly as the post-colonial subject (colonised body), whose class roots can be defined as working class

(present as new middle class in devolved Scotland), and Zoe as a member of the upper-middle class in Scotland. This class change and clash in the cultural climate after Devolution in Scotland is further discussed in Chapter Six which deals with the adaptation of *Three Sisters*.

In an interview for *The Scotsman*, Lochhead insisted that *Miseryguts*, although based on Molière's *The Misanthrope*, is a new play and not a new translation. Practically, Lochhead applied adaptation as modernisation of the classical text for the purposes of which she introduced quite a few changes but in general stayed faithful to her artistic voice. The linguistic medium of the play is not Scots but Scots-English, because:

that's the way we speak now. It's all Americanisms and Scotticisms and clichés and buzzwords and profanity," she laughs "MUCH casual profanity".  
(*The Scotsman* 2002)

which means that Lochhead continued to reflect the social change in the cultural images on stage linguistically with a very skilful ear for subtleties. Mahoney (*The Guardian*) acknowledges the sharp look of the playwright who skilfully avoids politically heavy topics and offers 'a light and easy viewing piece' with controversial subtexts and not-quite real life parallels. The abstinence from heavy political topics and the casual profanity the playwright herself draws to the attention of the audience transfers her artistic style of characterisation from her poetic works with the most persistent act of revision – re-signification which often leads to a lack of psychological depth of the characters and reasserts the question of representation as the complex matter of power relation and gender performativity. In order to assure the transparency of her message of identity playfulness, she adds that:

the guy doing the slagging is no right. He's not necessarily correct and is quite a sourpuss (*The Scotsman* 2002)

Another reason for highlighting profanity could be found in her poetic language of the 1990s in *Bagpipe Muzak*:

And it's all go (again) the Devolution debate and pro...  
Pro... proportional representation.  
Over pasta and pesto in a Byres Road bistro, Scotland  
Declares hersel' a nation. (Lochhead 1991, p. 25)

And in verbal ironic play, she reveals the political schemes behind the scene in order to conclude that:

... we hate the Government  
And we patently didnae elect it. (Lochhead 1991, p. 26)

This poetic/political statement is missing in the adapted text but contextually should have been perceived by the local audience.

*The Edinburgh Guide* reviewer finds the play convincingly and hilariously transposed to modern times. S/he praises Chisholm's performance and the set design of Geoff Rose, which similarly to the design of the second production of *Educating Agnes* in 2011 by the Royal Lyceum Theatre, suited the text very well –

a series of revolving rooms that give a true sense of different domestic spaces and a white cube art gallery (*The Edinburgh Guide* 2002)

S/he considers the only unconvincing moments both conceptually and dramaturgically to be the scenes between Alex and Celia, where her infidelity with various men 'who are little more than caricatures' did not provoke any laughter or sympathy until the very last scene.

*The Guardian* reviewer, Elizabeth Mahoney, and *The Scotsman* reviewer, Joyce McMillan, openly discuss the real personalities, who inspired this new version of Molière's classic, which are easily recognisable under the 'gauze-thin veils over her references to individuals' (Mahoney 2002). McMillan describes the protagonist as:

a television cultural pundit deeply disillusioned with the "new" Scotland, enraged by the shameless shagging around of his streaked-blond television newsreader fiancée, Celia Mann, and - yes - repelled by the self-serving hypocrisy of the political and chattering classes... (McMillan 2002)

However, McMillan is equally disappointed by the ending Lochhead gives and by the directorial re-interpretation (Cownie) of *Educating Agnes*:

And by the final act, when Lochhead gathers all her dramatic resources to give a bitter 21st-century twist to the sexual politics of the relationship between Alex and Celia, the play begins to move impressively towards the kind of slow-burning social tragedy Molière suggests. (McMillan 2002)

Contrary to McMillan's view, Sue Wilson for *The Independent* considers Lochhead's interpretation as 'faithful a tribute to the play's original begetter as one could wish

for' and believes her poetic talents have been applied with the utmost finesse to rhyme, rhythm and metre and dynamics of the dialogue (Wilson 2002).

To sum up, Lochhead as adaptor of Molière's plays works in the established tradition of the MacMolière family started by Kemp but with idiosyncratic stage Scots which varies from adaptation to adaptation and character to character. The Scottish satire she applies is political in character and aims at providing self-satire and irony to contemporary cultural and political images. Arnolphe presents both an archetypal and an overgeneralised cultural image of male objectification of the female image, as well as a grotesque reflection of cultural stereotypes.

In the second adaptation, the images are brought closer to cultural prototypes from contemporary life, which are easily identifiable by the local audience.

Both adaptations follow the conventional mode of transposition of set and action to the target culture with a certain degree of contemporariness, according to the goals the playwright sets for each adaptation.

The comical in *Educating Agnes* is achieved with the dichotomous interpretation of the characters as both types and round characters and the subverted genders as part of the gendered national question debate. The political subject is inserted as a female post-colonial body with increased visibility with the help of post-colonial dramatic techniques. As a result, the coloniser holds grotesque features and his status is degraded to that of the colonised, thus informing the discourse about political and national identities introduced by Hardwick. Further to this, Lochhead is also a contributor to the modern trend in theatre defined as 'performance slant' by the same critic with the effect of decolonisation of the classics (use of demotic language) and emphasis on non-verbal dramatic techniques. Those techniques, however, do not trespass the conventionally established model of British pantomime comedy with increased physicality on stage to suit the Scottish comedy actor. Moreover, the post-colonial female subject introduced greater visibility of the colonised body through the link between gender and race discourse, placing Agnes as a cultural exile from the dominant phallic cultural context, which due to the subverted genders linguistically, by ascribing modern to old-fashioned attitudes, appears asymmetric. Despite the grotesque, caricatured character of Arnolphe, the audience could

sympathise with him due to the visibility of the commedia stock characters. Lochhead skilfully applied Molière's characterisation of the trickster con-man figure, similar to the function of La Corbie in *MQS*, in both plays. Georgette (*Educating Agnes*) and Celia (*Miseryguts*) narrate the stories as the female voice of cultural experiences.

Lochhead pushed the dramatic form of the original from comedy of manners to farce and panto, which are the two variant performance interpretations the play has received. In 2008, McLaren presented the play as a pantomime with performative emphasis on the post-colonial reading of the play and visual signification. In 2011, director Cownie saw it as a farce and discarded the theme of sexual exploitation, which, in the view of the critic McMillan, brought the language back to the original and gave it an anachronistic flavour.

In the second adaptation, of what appears to be the darkest of Molière's comedies, the narrator's voice is frequently silenced and the colonised body loses its visibility behind social masks built verbally in the play. Moreover, the grotesque characterisation of the male characters pushes the tragi-comedic tone of the original into a melodramatic interpretation of the subject devoid of the audience's sympathy until the very end.

The endings of both of the revisited plays, similarly to previous adaptations of classics and poetry by Lochhead, are twisted. A common cultural image for both plays is the problematic self-deception of the phallic body, which bears satirical comments about the current debates about 'new Scotland'. In both plays, despite the five-year difference in their birth on the Scottish stage, the national and cultural images narrate desire for change and innovation, prevented by the traditional idea about duality in identity, leading to social hypocrisy in the view of the playwright. All possible new identities are thinly inscribed over the old cultural image. Both protagonists become victims of dominant social practices: Arnolphe is a blind follower of the American fashionable journalistic mode of speech. Alex, on the other hand, is blinded by his self-important remarks and disgust (all pretentious and self-



indulging to cover his cowardly feelings) to the hypocrisy in politics where all have acquired journalistic profane language.

Lochhead has introduced a similar genre modification to *Three Sisters* after Chekhov, which is a subject of discussion in the next chapter.

## References:

CAMERON, D., 1995. *Verbal Hygiene*. London: Routledge.

CALDER, A., 1993. *Molière: the Theory and Practice of Comedy*. London; Atlantic Highlands: Athlone Press.

CARSTAIRS, J., 2011. Review of *Educating Agnes* by Liz Lochhead. Royal Lyceum Edinburgh. *Edinburgh Spotlight.com*. [online] 15 April. [viewed 01 May 2013]. Available from: <http://www.edinburghspotlight.com/2011/04/review-educating-agnes-lyceum/>.

COX, M., 2008. Review of *Educating Agnes* by Liz Lochhead. *Theatre babel*, Glasgow Citizen's Theatre. *OnstagesScotland.com*. [online]. [viewed 19 December 2010]. Available from: <http://www.onstagescotland.co.uk/reviews/educatingagnes/>.

COX, M., 2011. Review of *Educating Agnes* by Liz Lochhead. Royal Lyceum Theatre, Edinburgh. *OnstagesScotland.com*. [online] [viewed 14 September 2012]. Available from: [http://www.onstagescotland.co.uk/reviews/educating\\_agnes/](http://www.onstagescotland.co.uk/reviews/educating_agnes/).

CRAVEN, S., 2008. Review of *Educating Agnes* by Liz Lochhead. Citizens Theatre, Glasgow. *The Herald*. [online] 28 April. [viewed 15 June 2012].

DIBDIN, T., 2008. Review of *Educating Agnes* by Liz Lochhead. *Theatre babel*. Glasgow Citizens Theatre. *The Stage*. [online] 28 April. [viewed 30 April 2013]. Available from: <http://www.thestage.co.uk/reviews/review.php/20530/educating-agnes>.

FINDLAY, B., 1996). The Founding of a Modern Tradition: Robert Kemp's Scots Translations of Molière at the Gateway In: CAMERON, A. & A. SCULLION. *Scottish Popular Theatre and Entertainment*. Glasgow University Library. pp. 113-115.

FISCHER-LICHTE, E., 2002. *History of European Drama and Theatre*. London, NY: Routledge.

FISHER, M., 2011. Review of *Educating Agnes* by Liz Lochhead. Royal Lyceum Theatre, Edinburgh. *The Guardian*. [online]. 12 April. [viewed 08 August 2012]. Available from: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/stage/2011/apr/12/educating-agnes-review>.

GAINS, J. F., 2002. *The Molière Encyclopedia*. Greenwood Publishing Group.

GILBERT, H. & J. TOMPKINS, 1996 (2002). *Post-colonial Drama*. London: Routledge.

HARVIE, J. & J. McDonald, 1993. Putting New Twists to Old Stories: Feminism and Lochhead's Drama In: CRAWFORD, R. and A. VARTY, eds. *Liz Lochhead's Voices*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. pp. 124-147.

HAY, E., 2011. Review of *Educating Agnes* by Liz Lochhead. Royal Lyceum Edinburgh. *TVbomb*. [online] 10 April. [viewed 01 May 2013]. Available from: <http://www.tvbomb.co.uk/2011/04/review-educating-agnes/>.

KRISTEVA, J., 1980. *Desire in Language*. NY: Columbia University Press.

LAKOFF, R. T., 2004. *Language and Woman's Place* Mary Bucholz ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

LAKOFF, R. T., 2000. *The Language War*. Berkley, LA, London: California University Press.

LALANDE, R., 2006. L'Ecole des Femmes: Matrimony and the Laws of Chance In: BRADBY, D. & A. CALDER, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to Molière*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 165-174.

LOCHHEAD, L., 1999. *Bagpipe Muzak*. London: Penguin Books.

LOCHHEAD, L., 2003. Liz Lochhead embarks on her own odyssey. Lochhead talks about her adaptation *Thebans* for *The Scotsman*. [online] 3 August. [viewed 01 May 2013].

Available from: <http://www.scotsman.com/news/liz-lochhead-embarks-on-her-own-odyssey-1-1292124>

LOCHHEAD, L., 2002. *Miseryguts & Tartuffe*. Nick Hern Books Ltd.

LOCHHEAD, L., 2008. *Educating Agnes*. London: Nick Hern.

MCLAREN, G., 2010. *Transcript*. Interview by M. Paraskevova. Glasgow: Glasgow Youth Theatre. 10 March.

MAHONEY, E., 2002. Review of *Miseryguts* by Liz Lochhead. *The Guardian*. [online] 26 March. [viewed 21 April 2012]. Available from: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/stage/2002/mar/26/theatre.artsfeatures>.

MCMILLAN, J., 2002. Taking the high and low roads *Miseryguts* Lachlan's Choice Hotel. Review of *Miseryguts* by Liz Lochhead. *The Scotsman*. [online]. March 27. [viewed 5 February 2012].

MCMILLAN, J., 2011. Makar's exemplary lesson. Review of *Educating Agnes* by Liz Lochhead. Royal Lyceum Theatre, Edinburgh. *The Herald*. [online]. 14 April. [viewed 17 June 2012].

MUGGLESTONE, L., 1993. Lochhead 's Language: Styles, Status, Gender and Identity In: CRAWFORD, R. and A. VARTY, eds. *Liz Lochhead 's Voices*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. pp. 94-102.

NORMAN, L.F., 1999 (2010). *The Public Mirror: Molière and the Social Commerce of Depiction*. The University of Chicago Press.

PHELAN, S., 1999. Bodies, Passions, and Citizenship In: CASS, S. F., ed. *Feminism, Identity and Difference*. London: Hekman. pp. 56-79.

RIGGS, L.W., 2005. *Molière and Modernity: Absent Mothers and Masculine Births*. USA: Rookwood Press.

RUSHTON, E., 2002. Priceless masterpiece on Sex, Lies and the Scots. Review of *Miseryguts* by Liz Lochhead. Royal Lyceum theatre, Edinburgh. *The Edinburgh Guide*. [online]. 24 March. [viewed 30 April 2013]. Available from: [http://www.edinburghguide.com/aande/theatre/reviews/m/miseryguts\\_rlt.shtml](http://www.edinburghguide.com/aande/theatre/reviews/m/miseryguts_rlt.shtml).

SCOLNICOV, H., 1994. *Woman's Theatrical Space*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

STEPHEN, A., 2010. Literal translation. *School for Wives*.

STEVENSON, R., 2004. Triumphant Tartuffification Liz Lochhead's Translation of Molière's Tartuffe In: FINDLAY, B., ed. *Frae Ither Tongues*. Multilingual Matters Ltd. pp. 106 - 122.

VARTY, A., 1993. Scripts and Performances In: CRAWFORD, R. and A. VARTY, eds. *Liz Lochhead's Voices*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. pp. 148-178.

VIEW FROM THE STALLS. 2008. Review of *Educating Agnes* by Liz Lochhead. *Theatre babel*, Glasgow Citizen's Theatre. 30 April. [Blog]. [online] [viewed 30 April 2013]. Available from: <http://www.viewfromthestalls.co.uk/2008/04/educating-agnes-april-2008.html>.

WILSON, S., 2002. Review of *Miseryguts* by Liz Lochhead. Royal Lyceum Edinburgh. *The Independent*. [online]. 30 March. [viewed 10 October 2012].

## Chapter Six

### **Between Carnival and Paranoia: Unbearable Identities in Lochhead's Adaptation of *Three Sisters***

Similarly to the previously discussed adaptations, Lochhead approached the classic in 2000 with the same idea of decolonisation, i.e. to reflect upon the post-colonial national debate and cultural identities in contemporary Scotland. The application of demotic idioms, inclusive of Scots as a class marker, informs the established discourse of immediate political debate in Scottish adaptations of the classics as defined by Hardwick and Hall and outlined in Chapter Three. Lochhead transposes the setting and action in Scotland as a reflection on the current national debate with a complex use of registers: a mix of Doric Scots, British and American English.

Following the playwright's model of adapting classical non-Molière texts mentioned in an interview with C. Gonzales (2004), the expected result would be a free interpretation of the characters and the structure of the play. The question central to the chapter is what kind of adaptation is Lochhead's version of the Chekhovian play and what cultural and gender images does it narrate.

Lochhead offers a contemporary version but, similarly to the adaptation of *Tartuffe* (1985), she places it vaguely in a past historical period. Such a style narrates an interest in the historical links of the past and the present. The theme is also explored in another play of the playwright. *Britannia Rules* (1999) is set in approximately the same historical period, with focus on the themes of language, class, sexuality and nation. This connection is also expressed linguistically through a revision of the old national model of the split cultural identity of the Scottish, in which the place of the "Other/foreign self" is attributed to the English self. These past national sentiments are satirised in order to undermine the original theme of nostalgia, which in the Scottish national question has always been a product of partial fictionalisation, expressed, in the view of Paterson, via the contrast use of English and Scots in Scottish drama, mentioned in Chapter Two. The emphasis on linguistic difference,

interpreted in the post-colonial context of the feminine as a visible colonised body, narrates a conflict between language and body. The current adaptation focuses on the subject of colonisation of the local culture and women with a reference to a dissolving national language. In it, the sexual difference is not completely deleted but reinscribed, in order to suggest a subsumed sexual identity by gender (Reizbaum 2005). The performed female identity is ecstatic, i.e. in the opinion of Kristeva, the feminine is completely silenced. The applied class difference defines the image of the mother as two-faced (the image is present also in Lochhead's poetry), which suggests a different interpretation of the cultural images from the playwright's previous adaptations. Kristeva's reading of the two-faced mother in her theory of the abject is a split between the image related to "beauty, art, writing" and the mother figure, who is tied to suffering and sacrifice. The latter is the image of "the masochistic mother who never stops working" and is mutually repulsive and fascinating (1982, p. 166). The second face of the mother has become, in the opinion of Kristeva, the new European identity of Woman, who experiences the sociosymbolic as a sacrificial contract (against their will). In French the phrase translates 'against their bodies'; i.e. "women are increasingly describing their experience of the violence of the symbolic contract as a form of a rape" (1981, p. 25).

Actress Louis Bolton (Irene) considers one of the main reasons behind the choice of a text Lochhead's personal interest in strong female characters such as the three sisters in Chekhov. Further, Caroline Devlin (Devlin 2012) suggests that Lochhead's motivation behind the adaptation of Chekhov was to remove it from the canonised, covered in dust, pedestal as a piece of classic. Bolton reaffirms it: 'Lochhead managed to make the play real, due to the language use the story was also easy to understand... the audience received the play very warmly and laughed at the most dramatic moments' (Bolton 2012). The use of demotic language, Doric Scots and other registers, not only evokes laughter and makes the play more at home, but also contributes to the more sympathetic portrayal of the characters as a general course of adaptation, applied by the dramatist for the reworks of Molière's and the Greek plays earlier. For Kristeva, the appearance of spoken language allows the emotions to

come through writing (1982, p. 200), similarly to the performance poetry that Lochhead had been hugely influenced by prior to devolution. The playwright also attributes phonetically spelt words (and italicised – the question of the use of italics is discussed later on in the chapter) to some of the characters in order to insert ironic comments. For instance, when the sisters present their talented brother to Vanderbilt (Vershinin), Livvy (Olga) mentions that he is ‘a *leetle* bit’ in love with a common (*Three Sisters*, p. 17).

In many respects the play could be viewed as a continuation of the collaborative project between the playwright and the director Tony Cownie, who in 1999 staged first *Shanghaied* and later its expanded version *Britannia Rules*, set in pre WW2 and post-war years (1930s -40s).

The story is based on true historical events but placed in non-naturalistic dramatic space and beautifully narrates, in the words of Cownie, a nostalgic and funny story which succeeds in showing the people emotionally as they were. The first part deals with the evacuation of three Glasgow working class children to the countryside during the Blitz, where they meet an upper-class youngster of similar age. The thematic material of the play studies serious questions about class and gender differences and cultural clash, especially in the meeting with the enemy: a German child. It is performed by adults among outsized furniture in order to bring a slight expressionistic effect. The play has a cinematic structure of a sequence of fifteen scenes. The second part deals with four of the characters fourteen years later when they meet on Coronation Day, and the conflict and humour reveal the challenges of class, nationalities, sexuality and gender of a new world, which are left unsettled. Reviewer Mark Fisher sees the play and characters incomplete. However, in the opinion of the director, Lochhead manages to show the social changes brought by the war in terms of the national psyche. In the second part, the directorial work of Cownie succeeds in isolating the moment of uncertainty between the reliable austerity of the old era and the unpredictable expansionism of the new.

*Three Sisters* by Lochhead is completely reframed; it is set in the North-Eastern part of the country in a post WW2 small town. The sisters have inherited The Philipsons’ School after the death of their father, which is located near an American air force

base. The historical period chosen by Lochhead for the setting of her version of Chekhov's *Three Sisters* in almost the same years is not accidental. Angus Calder (1997) argues that the 1940s and 1950s are the most 'unionist' decades in Scottish history. To turn to such an adaptation in 2000 when Scotland is about to start a new historical beginning (devolution) does not seem accidental either, as the question of Britishness becomes central theme in the adaptation. In the opinion of *The Scotsman* critic Joyce McMillan, the play speaks that 'Lochhead still seems uncertain whether she has come to bury the Britain of 1946 or to praise it', which is not surprising as the playwright avoids taking definitive political sides.

Although the choice of historical period 'fits beautifully' the Chekhovian play, in the view of McMillan, Fisher and Bolton, it also has its traps. For Bolton, it is the sense that the kind of aristocracy, or bourgeoisie, does not quite fit in post-war Scotland so there is a lack of historical truth (Bolton 2012). The opinion is also shared by Devlin, who remarks that the class theme is tricky to identify with, which makes the play not directly accessible to the audience (Devlin 2012).

Further to the historical misrepresentation, the adaptation also receives criticism about the emotional untruthfulness of national sensibilities. Kate Basset finds the introduced Anglo-Scots class tensions contradictory to British-Russian sensibilities:

Chekhov's Russians might share the British mid-century characteristics of being buttoned-up and trying to smile politely through grim times. This is in contrast to the accepted notion of his characters freely bursting into laughter and tears. (Basset 2000)

It is questionable if Lochhead's representations aimed at a mimesis of Scottish history and national sensibilities in their accurate, but also clichéd, perceptions. Kristeva claims that, during that same post-war period (WW2), national identity in Europe has been lost and replaced with trans-nationality (1981, p. 14). Kristeva bases her idea on the study of historical time by Friedrich Nietzsche, who opposes traditional linear history with a new, cursive time, called 'monumental history' by the same philosopher. Kristeva applies it in order to describe women's history, which looks upon 'the problematic of women in Europe within inquiry on time, that time which the feminist movement both inherits and modifies' (1981, p. 14). Lochhead belongs to the group of women writers with aesthetic and psychoanalytic experiences who openly refuse linear temporality. In the opinion of Kristeva, this



new movement of women sought to 'give a language to the intrasubjective and corporeal experiences left mute by culture in the past' (1981, p. 19). Therefore, the adaptation Lochhead offers is a faithful but also free interpretation of Chekhov, in the sense that the stories and characters are close to the original, but the cultural realia, setting and language bring the play close to the Scottish audience in the fashion of classical literary translation works. It is also an attempt to appropriate Chekhov for the Scottish stage, similarly to her adaptations of Molière earlier, narrated from a strictly woman's point of view.

Lochhead preserves the original ages of Olga, Masha and Irena but attributes to them an English upper middle class identity, with an Oxford education which replaces the symbolic image of Moscow. Further to the ironic reading of the setting, the Russian aristocratic background is lowered to English middle class one, according to which the literally transposed behaviour of the sisters appears somewhat unusual and untypical (foreign to the local culture), thus causing a split in the traditional perceptions of class by the receptive culture. It also corresponds to Reizbaum's argument that Scottish experience of their culture has a foreignness inside. Therefore, Lochhead focuses on the symbolical signification of the family in all of her adaptations, including the current adaptation. Moreover, the playwright again links the subject with Kristeva's concept of the abject, because after 1968 there is a new arrangement of differences which led to interiorisation of abjection. This difference is reabsorbed in speech and threatens the symbolic within (1981, p. 113), in a similar fashion to the newly established cultural identity readings after Devolution in Scotland, also mentioned by Scullion.

Apart from transposing the setting to a Scottish context and offering an appropriate change of names, Lochhead replaces all cultural realia with Scottish ones. All Russian poets: Gogol, Pushkin and Lermontov become Burns in the mouth of Sludden, and Alfred Tennyson in the hands of Milly. The silver samovar (a gift from the doctor to Irene at her birthday) is replaced with pearls and the troika is replaced with a new car. The Carnival event is a visit of the Burns Night Choir and the Big Fire is an accident in the American Air Force of a plane crash and its consequences.

Lochhead's domesticated version of the play narrates the same universal, in the view of the playwright, story but the characters have become Scottish/American, despite the close resemblance to their Russian prototypes. This, in the view of Pavis, allows the playwright to read the classical text as intracultural theatre with the idea of self-reflexivity. The same idea is supported by Erika Fischer-Lichte who argues that European theatre symbolically structures a liminal space as a fundamental precondition for the occurrence of *conditio humana*, i.e. a space for the creation and change of cultural identities (Fischer-Lichte 2002, p. 2). Following her traditional style of adapting the classics as popular/universal stories, Lochhead retells them with Scottish voice and links them to the contemporary cultural context, often with the idea of a twist at the end. However, for the Chekhovian version the playwright does not offer such an ending but makes the speeches of the sisters, especially Irene's last words, sound unnatural:

IRENE: I'll go away. Tomorrow I'll not-marry my not-husband  
But I'll go and live there in that house anyway, with my  
Not-husband not there (A CRY) Oh!... (*Three Sisters*, p. 94)

The de-naturalization of language could be interpreted through the prism of Fischer-Lichte's theory, according to which drama and performance in the European history of theatre have different functions and the traditional formation of identity is based on the link between language and body, both of which stand symbolically for identity in theatre (Fischer-Lichte 2002, p. 5). The loss of the tight bond between the two represents a dramatic structure, which does not follow the conventional reading of the play, but suggests a move towards the non-dramatic, performative text, whose main function is described by Lichte's term *cultural performance* and links it directly to the question of cultural identity (2002, p. 3). Frequently, such a dramatic/dramaturgical technique in post-dramatic theatre inserts a speech act as action and causes a split between physical body and word with the incentives that:

It [the word] does not organically reside in his/her body but remains a  
*foreign body*. (Lehmann 2006, p. 158)

Such disturbed images also correspond to the previously mentioned sociosymbolic contract as sacrificial for women, who experience it against their bodies as an act of rape under a language of violence, as a mere reference to the running war at the

background of the story in the play. In the view of Kristeva (1982), such language is strange and violent because it serves as a radical instrument of separation or rejection at the limit of hatred (p. 200). The last words of Irene, quoted previously, narrate not only self-irony but also bitterness, self-hatred and disgust. They resemble the language of negativity applied by Lochhead in her poetry as a means of affecting the symbolic; or, as Kristeva points out, while the symbolic negates the semiotic, the semiotic replies with negativity. This is further confirmed by the end of the quote:

IRENE:.. And I'll take the job too. It's waiting for me. I'll be useful. I'll  
Give my life to it. The winter will come and Jack Frost will nip  
Out toes but I'll go on working and working. (*Three Sisters*, p. 94)

The repulsion towards working women is self-projected. It is so because, as Fischer-Lichte claims, on the one hand, Irene as a character is predominantly self-focused (2002, p. 259) and on the other, she is also the abjected body who uses the language of the father in order to identify.

As a contemporary reference, Bolton points at the main question of identity – who, what and where we are today in Scotland. From the perspective of a Scottish female artist she shares that she personally was affected professionally as an actress speaking with English accent, due to the still purveying anti-English feeling in Scotland. Bolton (2012) agrees that the question of Scottish identity needs to be revisited ‘because there are a lot of people who live and contribute to the country’s development but do not sound Scottish’. She attributes such attitudes to the established practices of Scottish identity being directly related to the Scottish accent and the obvious desire of Scottish audiences to ‘want to see their identity, their lives and their country and their culture’ on the stage (Bolton 2002).

The Anglo-Scottish friction is not a straightforward representation of cultural difference but a mirror of Scottish society in its complexity and class differences. For example, the political subject of opposition between Scotland and England is introduced with the ironic comment of Fergus Pow (ambiguous too) as irony at the current Scottish cultural emancipation:

FERGUS POW: Same fellae tellt me he heard on the wireless – says that they were gonnae stretch a rope along the border between Scotland an England.  
ANDREW: A rope? What for?  
FERGUS POW: Dinna ken. Bloke tellt me.  
(Act II, p. 35)

Further to it, the indirect representation of class in Scotland asserts the sense of uneasiness and immobility. On the one hand, this could be interpreted as a dominant cultural sentiment in 2000 Scotland, pointing at the need to work and take personal responsibility, similarly to Greig and Arnott's thematic interpretations in their plays immediately after Devolution. Lochhead's version satirises it through the character of Irene, who as the youngest member of the community, acts upon the new fashion of working women, who by the end of the play experiences this ideal as a delusion but stays trapped in the social image. On the other hand, it can be read as a female voice for the social position of women and their marginalisation by the contemporary patriarchal culture as a means to insert the complex processes of formation of a Scottish cultural identity. The assigned social roles and delusions of the classes inform a new shared cultural mythology in the nationalist debate divorced of the past.

However, the reasons behind transposing the play into the Scottish context is not so much to focus on the cultural difference between Scotland and England and how it gradually fuses into something different, but to show women's social images under the male gaze.

The three sisters are cultural outsiders/exiles to the parochial small town setting. On the one hand, Lochhead satirises the old sentiment of nostalgia as part of the Scottish cultural identity and the new offshoot of the myth, with the recurrent theme of the return of the exile in the cultural space as barren and futile (none of the sisters gives prodigy). On the other hand, since the sisters, inclusive of the sister-in-law, are presented as mirror reflections of the male gaze (Lacanian interpretation of the feminine), the playwright inscribes the female subject on the dominant masculine discourse as a colonised body, with the subtle link of class and race projected into gender.

Race is introduced with class difference as the other/foreign body in the cultural context appear to be the English speaking sisters belonging to the upper-middle class. The visualized colonised body is that of Nettie, a Scottish working class woman who is ridiculed about her appearance, language/accent and ignorance (lack of culture in the sense of education). The sisters belong to the English class and their interest in American men traces new cultural hegemony traditionally perceived as a cultural trait of the governing elite in Unionist Scotland, already discussed in Chapter One. The old linguistic English/ Scottish split image is complicated, with experiences of American culture which corresponds to the theatre trends in the 1990s with the presentation of the dynamics of the national question in Scotland. The divide between the national and the international (e.g. Greig's *Europe*, etc.) is a direct reflection of the dominant political nationalist rhetoric. Reizbaum's argument about the 'imported foreignness inside' for the Scottish cultural images in the current adaptation can be interpreted in two ways. Firstly, in the national question debate, it represents a colonised local culture through the oppressed national language (Scots) shown through the colonised body of Nettie. Secondly, in terms of female characterisation, it presents women as socially silenced using a foreign language (either English or Scots as a social class male marker) despite their education (Reizbaum 2005, p. 190). This, on the one hand attributes the main characters ambiguity, similarly to the previously discussed adaptations and their female protagonists. Therefore, Lochhead's adaptation raises a voice against gender silencing of women through the applied nationalist discourse in the local culture and, again, inserts class and language as social constructs which are ideologically loaded (Harvie 1993).

The three sisters are described as 'the notorious Philipsons' sisters', who dislike the local men (and women) and are mad about Yankees, which introduces a slightly populist, clichéd and melodramatic tone. However, this fascination with American culture is historically predetermined by the years of WW2, when America, not Britain, was seen as the land of many opportunities. In such a way, Lochhead also links European to American women's experiences, by drawing upon the Westernised perception of women founded upon common religious beliefs. In *Stabat Mater* essay

Kristeva describes it as a highly complex relationship between Christ and his Mother, which brought an understanding of a matrix of amorous relationships such as God to mankind, man to woman, son to mother, etc. which ‘soon gave rise to questions not only involving *causality* but also *time* (1985, p. 138). This is further developed into a never-ending cycle, imitating the process of childbirth – Mary is not only her son’s *mother* but also his *daughter* and *wife* (1985, p. 139). Therefore, all these three images are dominant in the characterisation of the sisters but not fixed: Irene is the child but also the wife to be; Milly is the ‘ideal’ wife but also the amorously idealised woman; Livvy is seen as the idealised mother, the Virgin. In contrast, Nettie is attributed all three – the child, the wife and the mother. However, as a clype figure, Nettie is also the other face of the Mother – the victim, colonised body, suffering but also working. The three sisters are also victimised bodies brought to suffering by the culture to which they have been forced to adapt and mostly failed to do so. The theme of victimisation is partially present in the original too, but Lochhead has expanded it with the female post-colonial subject reading of the cultural identity question in Scotland. According to Fischer-Lichte, the main theme in the play by Chekhov is the painful experience of an identity crisis (2002, pp. 258-259). She characterises Chekhov’s world as the world of fatherless family, which has left very deep traces in the lives of the children. These themes have been used by Lochhead too in order to open a debate about a new phase of cultural identities in Scotland after Devolution. For instance, the beginning of the play is a celebration of the anniversary of the death of the father, which, symbolically read, offers space for personal identity and self-realisation:

... the brother and the sisters are now independent of their father, they are free to live according to their own desires and are responsible for their own lives.  
(Fischer-Lichte, p. 258)

However, as Fischer-Lichte points out, the tragedy is rooted in the fact that the siblings are too much shaped by their father’s beliefs and education to the extent that they lack cultivation of individual personality (2002, p. 259). This specific aspect of the characterisation allows Lochhead to insert the theme of colonisation in the narrative of the revised version and show it through the individual suffering of the female characters. From the three sisters, it is only Milly (Masha), who is the most

flexible and open to change. Olga and Irena seem unable to alter their own lives according to their desires. Irena stays focused too much on herself, which seems to be the biggest obstacle for her social inaptitude and drives her to the state of hatred and self-hatred. Fischer-Lichte claims that the lack of personal individuality of the characters, especially of the sisters, is conditioned by the education they have received with the dominant voice of the father. Lochhead politicises it by expanding the theme of personal individuality as a constructed, social (post-colonial) reading of femininity. Further to Chekhov's disbelief in the powers of language to express true human emotions (Fischer-Lichte, p. 261), Lochhead adds the theme of oppressive language as the language of the coloniser. She has left all the non-narrative elements (nonsense words, musical expression) which help her build a choradramatic space and expand the function and meaning of silence, as muteness and inaudibility, with the theme of violence as a linguistic expression of abjection. The inaudibility in the text has also been inscribed graphically by the frequent use of italicised words or expressions, which look like scars left onto the body-text. Most of the time, the irony they reveal is bitter and full of pain. Those 'scars' could be interpreted as a matrix of silences to which Lochhead wanted to draw the attention of her audience. Among the most repeated italicised words is 'suffering', e.g. Tulliver-Smith 'there *is* still so much *suffering*' (p. 16) and Vanderbilt 'our *suffering*' (p. 41). The use of italics when the male characters address the female characters refer to the masculine perception of women, for instance 'crying' describes Nettie's emotional state but also introduces her as the suffering colonised body (p. 29), who, as a contrast, is the 'innocent' woman for Andrew before their marriage (p. 29). Irene is 'pure/angel' for Sludden (p. 53). Chisholm sees the three sisters as '*cultured pearls*' (p.10) metaphorically referring to the sisters, which Olivia instantly associates with tears (p.10), i.e. suffering. Vanderbilt's perception of the hostesses is close to the divine image of Woman: '*how do you do, three sisters... your face, Olivia*', or '*how do you do, three your, Olivia*', which clearly adds to the previously identified character of Olivia by Chisholm as the mother of the family, or the Christian reading of identity of Woman as a mother, child and wife figures. Milly's character is identified via the single italicised words 'blues' and 'picture' (p. 8; p. 70), whose ideas about love have been constantly nourished by art (books and movies), to which Lochhead adds 'woman's

magazine' in order to stress the concept of marriage for love and the disappointing memories of her current marriage (p. 9). Ironically, Milly's present husband Colquhoun describes himself with the self-ironical '*absence of same*' (p. 75). When Andrew's words contain italicised words, they function as a strong self-ironic remark: '*Who* left it on? *Mister Nobody*' (p. 33). In contrast, when italics are used by the female characters they speak of an agony and suffering; for example Irene presents herself as a negated, abjected body: 'Irene: No stop! *I* have! I'm *not* crying' (p. 68), i.e. '*I not*' identity. A similar form of silence is found in the relationship between the baron Nigel and the Scottish socialist Sludden, put forward by Lochhead as the long term unresolved friction between the English and the Scottish:

TULLIVER-SMITH (to Sludden): You're always off sitting in a corner  
Somewhere all by yourself, brooding! Come on Sludden!  
Let's make up, have a dram together, eh?  
SLUDDEN: Make up...?

TULLIVER-SMITH: Straighten things out... between us.

SLUDDEN: Make up *whit* exactly?

TULLIVER-SMITH: It's, it's, it's, it's just that I-I-I feel there is  
Some... animosity? Between us? In the air? Don't you?

The emotion, which Lochhead has added to the characters' experiences, is disgust and repulsion as psychological reflexes caused by negation, which are not found in the original (Russian) playtext. For instance, Livvy's '*leetle*', Sludden's dismissive remarks about women and philosophy (Act I, p. 9), or his splashes with bay rum, inserted in stage directions, due to 'self-disgust' (Act I, p. 7).

In Act I Irene is radiant with joy, described as a bit childish and innocent, with her serious face of revelation about the secret of happiness that man should work, which Lochhead ironically subverts by saying that 'by man one means woman too'. The angelic and innocent looks of Irene are contrasted to her coarse language compared to that of a miner:

IRENE: But he's a bore. Overpaid, oversexed and over here. (Act I, p. 4)

TULLIVER-SMITH: ... be nice and polite to him, Irene, because whiles you've a tongue on you like a collier, Miss, I don't like to hear it... (Act I, p. 12)



The discrepancy between image and language introduced by the playwright supports the previously suggested dominant topic of a conflict between body and language. Kristeva claims that 'the Child enables one imagine angels in the feminine', i.e. the abject encounter with the feminine sex has been deferred and in this way 'the sexual component being everywhere is actually nowhere' (1982, p. 168). In this sense, the image has been reiterated in the introduction of Nettie as a character, the child-dancer appears as an image of pure beauty gazed upon as the opposite of the mother language (1982, p. 163). Kristeva further claims that its most perfect form is that of a ballerina, 'preferably a foreigner, without language if need be, all sensitivity and acrobatics' (1982, p. 166).

Milly, the second sister and the wife, spends a lot of her time reading. She is often pretentious, melodramatic, and also 'superstitious'. In Lochhead's reading the irony is that she is the arty and attention seeker type Vanderbilt has already married:

MILLY: ... And today— today two men and a dog, if that's not an exaggeratedly lively way of describing old Chisholm. More fun at a funeral! I'm not fit company today, got *the blues*, don't I? Ignore me! (Act I, p. 8)

The self-ironic remark speaks of a conscious choice of behaviour and, being the most artistic of the three sisters, she is also the most rebellious. The whimsical movement in and out of the room is similar to her freedom to enter and leave the symbolic space at her will, which represents the third type of silence previously discussed in Chapter Five, defined by Gilbert & Tompkins, as the conscious act of staying silent. Milly's artistic voice, in the view of Kristeva, 'redoubles the social contract by exposing the unsaid, the uncanny' (1981, p. 31), which is loaded with irony as in the quote above. As mentioned earlier, apart from serving as the ideal wife, Milly is seen as the idealised lover, which Kristeva claims to happen when 'one can ward off the fear aroused by the sexual desire that women are assumed to have for a man' (1981, p. 163).

Livvy is the oldest sister, a spinster, who is both complaining and very sarcastic with all:

LIVVY: Oh my God, pearls! They're something like dowager would be seen dead in! I can't bear it.  
Pearls mean tears! (Act I, pp. 10-11)

Livvy is explicitly referred to as the mother among the sisters as being the oldest but also the virgin sister. She is turned into the muted voice of all women by the end of the play. For instance, in the final scene of the play her last words narrate something close to a female history:

LIVVY: Passes. All passes. We will be forgotten. Even that there were *three* of us. Now. Oh my darlings. And our suffering dear sisters. *Today*. Forgotten or *blessed and forgiven* in the future by those who may *know* what it is all for; sisters, I feel absurdly sure we are on the verge of *knowing*.  
What is it all for? – oh if only, if only we knew!  
(p. 94)

The italicised message reads ‘*Three today blessed and forgiven know knowing*’, which could be referring to a state of exorcism of the national in the understanding of Reizbaum or hinting towards freedom from the past and writing a new, women’s history, in the view of Kristeva.

Of all the female characters, it is the three sisters who play their characters consciously, especially in the company of ‘high’ society, and constantly interject ironic remarks about it. Therefore, the filter through which the audience witnesses the drama is the personal experiences of the middle class women – the three sisters. The role ascribed to them by the playwright brings closeness to the trickster con-man figures in Molière and the Chorus and prophet figures in the Greek tragedies, which are deviations of the image and function of La Corbie in the *MQS* play. Such a behaviour pattern is especially relevant for Irene and the patronising ‘philosophical’ remarks of Tulliver-Smith:

Irene: ... Man must work! And by man I mean woman too!  
Work. That’s one’s whole raison d’être in the final analysis

Tulliver-Smith: Didn’t Freud say so? W-W-Work and ... and I-I-love  
Irene! That’s what makes the world go round. (Act I, p. 5)

Here Lochhead also does not miss the opportunity to ironise men’s rational abilities and knowledge, which means that similarly to previous adaptations Lochhead applies the sexual difference in order to remind the audience of the socially constructed

images of men and women and of the established social and political inequality. Women again are depicted as the stronger sex, bearers of rationality and pragmatism. In contrast, the male characters appear as emotional, irrational, romantic, delusional and empty philosophers.

For instance in the opening scene Chisholm bursts into a lengthy string of synonyms for ‘nonsense’:

CHISHOLM: Tosh! Tosh and tripe! Gibberish and balderdash! (Act I, Scene 1, p. 2)

The irrational (not fit for philosophy) woman is the generally shared social opinion about women spoken by Sludden:

If a *man* should make the attempt to philosophise, then an  
Attempt at philosophy is what you’ll get.  
But if a woman, or worse still, *a couple of*  
*Women* start in at it – oh dear God almighty!  
(Act I, p. 9)

Ironically, the inscribed emotion in italics in the above quote reads as a sign of masculine dismissal towards women: ‘*Man, a couple of Women*’.

Further to the socio-linguistic readings of the images of the women, Lochhead also adds fictional references by alluding to famous classical dramatic heroines. In the scene with Vanderbilt’s departure Milly performs an Ophelian character, while at their first encounter she plays some of the character traits of Katherine from *The Taming of the Shrew*. Irene is compared to Helen of Troy (p. 77) and Nettie is seen as a lady Macbeth (p. 69). Such a technique Fischer-Lichte identifies as early as the works of Euripides, who consciously fictionalises his character in order to undermine the established political identity and the interpretation of personal identity related to the dominant culture of the Greek polis (Fischer-Lichte 2002, p. 27).

As already discussed, class difference splits the image of the Mother. The sisters belong to the class of intellectual women, which in the view of Kristeva is as grotesque as its double – the working class, or the victimised woman. The intellectual is fated to prove the absurdity of male reason, while the mistress and

victim, who are capable of neither music nor beauty, breaks out inside the world as a crafty ruler of social institutions (from families to small businesses) (1982, p. 169) for which the character of Nettie fits well. She, as the anti-intellectual, ironically swaps places with the sisters in order to become the 'ideal' housewife and mother thus fleshing out (in the original too) the *Commedia dell'Arte* setup in which classes are subverted. Apart from her greediness and pettiness, constantly ridiculed by the rest of the family members and rooted in her social background, Nettie is also predominantly defined by her children, or the motherly function in society.

In this role, she, similarly to the three sisters, is socially silenced too, or in the words of Meyerhoff:

If you gag a person or forbid them to speak in a particular social context, then you have silenced them. (Meyerhoff 2004, p. 211)

For instance, Nettie is ironically referred to as 'Lady Macbeth' by Milly when seen to cross the room with a lit candle just as Milly is ready to reveal her secret love for the colonel (Act III, p. 69). The mention of this female tragic character is not accidental: it refers ironically to the Scottish tragedy and the ambitions for power. Read with the idea of national identity reflection, Nettie is a representative of the working class colonised body, which acquires the language of the upper class/dominant culture and transforms from colonised into a coloniser. Therefore, she can be interpreted as a complicated image related to the question of internal colonisation in the national debate. In the context of abjection, Kristeva attributes to the figure of Lady Macbeth the narcissistic essence of the feminine, which bares the death drive, or, in brief 'is shown as the two facets of an otherness that cannot be sublimated – the sexual and the repressed' as prototypes of an abject femininity (1982, p. 169).

The two faces of the Mother: the woman full of art and beauty, and the ugly, repulsive working one, are also perceived as two different modes of behaviour in society defined by the relationship of women to power. On the one hand, the sisters are the intellectual, capable women, who appear hysterical. Kristeva claims that the hysterical woman is merely a carnival puppet due to her attempts to 'perversely get around' the law. Such are the female characters of Medea, Celia, Jocasta in

Lochhead's previous adaptations. On the other hand, their opposite, the sister-in-law in Lochhead's adaptation, acts in the society in a paranoid fashion, i.e. it 'becomes successful by making of herself the expression of a murderous sociality' (1982, p. 168).

Additionally, Kristeva claims that such a reading of history (following the fate of seemingly harmless women) by Celine in *Powers of Horror*, turned the tragedy experienced by soldiers in the war into a farce (p. 167). Possibly, Lochhead's application of the same subject placed in the Scottish context has produced a similar generic effect on the text/story.

Cynthia Marsh argues that Chekhov has started to disturb the conventions of realist representation in *Three Sisters* and the end of the play questions the relationship between actresses and characters they played (2000, p. 204). This artificiality of the theatrical is found also in his final play *The Cherry Orchard* in which women played seminal part, according to the same critic (Marsh 2000, p. 204). Lochhead's version also detaches from reality and the transposition of Russian sisters to English ones creates incongruence as a source of irony, in the way Harvie observed as problematisation of representation, further reinforced with the mirror reflections of female identities under the male gaze.

The mix of the classes (and nationalities) and the explored themes resemble the storyline and characters of *Britannia Rules* (1999). Although *Three Sisters* does not implicitly show children-characters and the war at the background explicitly as in *Britannia Rules*, it does refer to similar gender, class and race issues. The dramatic form and language of both works are also very different. However, the expressionistic flavour of the early play by Lochhead does find resonance in the adaptation of the Chekhov's play, especially with the use of dramatic devices like dolls and mirrors. These recurrent images have become favourite for the playwright, since the revision of her first play *Blood and Ice* for Pepper's Ghost Theatre Company in February 1994, with the sole purpose of presenting merging female

identities, i.e. ‘to show the manner in which women have internalised views of themselves promulgated by male hegemony’ (Harvie & McDonald 1993, p. 149).

Such a characterisation is given to Nettie, who appears as the colonised body at the birthday party in Act I, at which everybody stares and judgementally analyses her dressing taste. Andrew spins her around so that everyone at the dinner party could see her (Act I, p. 26). The image is visually repeated with the spinning dancer in the music box, which Irene is given as a present by two airforce men. Further, Nettie is a subject of constant mockery for her ignorance, first for her clothes (visual image), then for her language use (language ignorance), therefore she belongs to a lower class in the gaze of a coloniser. This character interpretation also directly corresponds to Gilbert & Tompkin’s idea of staging post-colonial drama in which the female, colonised body is overlooked and silenced. It also presents the dominant trend in Anglo-American criticism to look for the signs of such social silencing. For instance, Nettie’s attempt to put a restrain to the sudden emotional burst of Milly is ridiculed by Tulliver-Smith:

NETTIE: Now, now! No need for language! Milly, my darling, you are a lovely looking girl – now. I know you’ll take this the way it is meant – but, pet, when you open your mouth you give yourself a showing up.

TULLIVER-SMITH is unsuccessfully suppressing his laughter at Nettie as he glares at him: Got the sniffles... Make myself a toddy. (Act II, p. 46)

In the original:

My dear Masha, need you use such expressions? You know with your good looks you’d be thought to be harming, even by the best people yes – I honestly mean it – if only you wouldn’t use those expressions of yours! Je vous prie, pardoner moi, Marie, mais vous avez des manieres un peu grossieres. [transl. ‘Please, excuse me, Marie, but you have a little coarse mannered’]

TOOZENBACH [with suppressed laughter]: Pass me.... I say, will you please pass me... is that cognac over there, or what? (1994, pp. 285-286)

This scene actually shows how Nettie is muted as a character. Furthermore, she acts as a paranoid, which complies with Kristeva’s view about the second, social image of the two-faced Mother. Hence, the Danube Waltz, the music from the box, is further repeated at the end of Act III. Everybody expects the Burns Night Choir and gets

engrossed into cheerful dancing and singing to the piano accompaniment of Nigel. The party mood is abruptly ceased by Nettie, the non-artist, who by that moment has completely embraced and performed the Scottish cultural identity – a subtle ironical remark by Lochhead about the Calvinistic attitudes of the Scots towards free emotional expression and entertainment sacrificed for the name of peaceful family life. The hegemonic power of paternal Scotland is demonstrated by the image of Nettie, with a slightly demonic face of control and power ambitions. Nettie starts to use more Scottish English with the progress of the play apart from some quaint colloquial and slang words like ‘bobbydazzler’ (p. 32) and phrases and words like ‘thon oldfella, the nam Pow’ (p. 33). However, what is more significant is that her pettiness and ignorance is continuously mocked until Nettie has a second child in Act III. She becomes the sole mistress of the house and her power is demonstrated in the opening scene of Act III. Nettie directly confronts Livvy and scolds the old Nanny for being lazy, very old and inefficient:

NETTIE: Why you keep on that Old Useless Article I don’t know! (Act III, p. 59)

As opposed to:

NATASHA: I can’t understand why you keep that old woman in the house. (Act III, p. 296)

Nettie’s power is further demonstrated by her arrogant attitude towards her new maid at the end of the play. Seen through the already established national discourse in the script by Lochhead, the second alternative of locally bred sentiments with the performative role of Nettie as a voice of the working class members is also a *cul de sac* path. As a result, the uneasy feeling of being trapped in the contemporary Scottish cultural scene posits the question ‘what is there for the future of the Scots?’ The pettiness and ambitiousness of the working class though appropriating the middle class riches and status do not offer any forward thinking. Nettie is not conscious of her own actions and is often ridiculed about it. Moreover, from a colonised, oppressed body, she transforms into a narrow-minded oppressor of her own lot. However, she is also somehow a sympathetic character, as are all of the other satirised characters in the play, without any exceptions, complying with the style of Lochhead defined in the previous chapters. For instance, Lochhead

undermines Scottish cultural and nationalist mythology through satirising the Scottish male characters of Milly's husband, Colquhoun, and Sludden. Colquhoun is laughed at for his 'intelligence' and education as a metonymic reference to Kailyardism, whereas the working class poetic shadow of Burns. Sludden, is a comic reference to Clydeism and the nationalistic aspirations for socialist Scotland. Chisholm, as a character, parallels well with the established Scottish image of the Edinburgh doctor, who has gone out of practice long ago and struggles with his old drinking habits.

Furthermore, another textual reference well adopted by Lochhead and assigned a different meaning is the ghost presence of female images as a metaphor for the Phallic Mother and a way to show how the male characters build their relationship with the women of their aspirations. Two female images are constantly present in the background although not being given a character: the nameless mother of the sisters, ironically better remembered by the doctor and the colonel but not the siblings, and the second wife of Colonel Vanderbilt. Lochhead plays again with mirroring effect and symmetry in characterisation as she turns Livvy in the 'spitting image of her mother' ('Vanderbilt: You're the image of your mother! I mean...' Act I, p. 15). This implies that the character of Livvy is not only muted, but also invisible. Her psychological image is mirrored in the character of Nanny with whom they have a very long-term and close relationship, almost like being married. Perhaps, Livvy sees her future self in her servant's. She becomes a successful career woman but not so successful in her personal life. Milly is turned into a mirror image of Vanderbilt's second wife: 'arty type, attention seeker, suicidal' (Act I, p. 4). What seems to connect them is their love for the miraculous, odd, magical and mysterious in life, ironically showed with their first date in the dark:

VANDERBILT: Are you superstitious, Milly?

MILLY: No touch wood (BEAT – deleted in script by director) [obviously playing it.] Yes, I am. Of course, I am...

VANDERBILT: Strange. Magnificent. Magical. Woman...  
It's dark in here but your eyes are shining.  
(Act II, p. 37)



Irene is the idolised woman, metaphorically defined as Helen of Troy by Sludden and Nigel. In contrast to Livvy, she is visible but brought to a state of inaudibility by the two dominant masculine discourses. Sludden is an epitome of the past Scottish irrational/mad poetic voice, sharing strong socialist views. Tulliver-Smith is his alter ego, or 'the philosophical, rational mind', which perceives women as deserving eternal admiration. They both could be read as the two faces of a revised Caledonian Antisyzygy image.

Lochhead does not tend to describe Scottish men in a positive light. They are usually victims of their sexual prejudices and filled with fear towards women which prevents them from experiencing love and happiness. Therefore, all female characters choose other, usually English or American, men. For instance, Medea is/was in love with Jason (English), Antigone with Haemon, who is the son of Kreon (English in Lochhead's version), Agnes falls in love with Horace, also English and the three sisters Irene and Milly choose Americans, and Nettie marries Englishman, Andrew. However, if they happen to love a Scottish man, like Celia, they are left with a lot of bitterness and alone. Furthermore, as presented as the weaker sex by the playwright, the male characters appear in their androgynous form of male/female, e.g. Sludden and Nigel, i.e. the gaze is split. In such a way Lochhead achieves showing how meaning is textually produced. According to Harvie, Lochhead re-inscribes not only the meaning of the original but also its contexts, in order to highlight its ideological face (Harvie & McDonald 1993, p. 136). The main technique applied for this purpose is 'textual self-referentiation and self-problematisation.... with repeated emphasis through imagery and plot on representation, e.g. .... dolls and in mirrors (Harvie & McDonald 1993, p. 136).

An example of textual self-referentiation and meta-theatrical device is the use of mirrors in two very important moments in the play. In the first one, Irene mutters to her mirror reflection after Nettie manages to send everybody home and spoils the party spirit. It is an act of subjectification of the space, or post-dramatic device for isolating the voice of the narrator.

Stays centre stage, looks at herself in the mirror:

IRENE: All gone. Everybody's gone, .... / Oh Oxford Oxford Oxford... (Act III, p. 56)

The second self-referential comment is spoken by Chisholm, again in front of a mirror. Lochhead rarely inscribes her own voice, but the message below is clearly delivered as follows:

CHISHOLM: ... May be you are no real  
Maybe that's the real man in there [pokes at  
mirror] and the woman didn't die. Life's an illusion! It's  
all done with mirrors, eh! (weeps)... (Act III, p. 61)

The playwright addresses 'directly' the audience through the words of Chisholm, that what they see is not reality (not realistic representation) but is a dramatised interpretation from a woman's point of view (both female and Scottish), as a voice of suffering. Therefore, the spoken identity is not just an unbearable female but also an unbearable cultural identity. Kristeva argues that such identity is experienced when the boundary between subject and object (abjection) is shaken and the limit between inside and outside becomes uncertain, as in the quote above (1982, p. 144). The lines are iterated by a drunk man, which is an ironic remark/reference to MacDiarmid's poem 'A Drunk Man speaks to a Thistle' as a symbolic representation of the old Renaissance nationalist ideals of the middle classes in Scotland.

Furthermore, through the image of Chisholm, Lochhead accomplishes a more native humour and establishes higher intimacy with the spectators. By limiting the fabula to a family story the playwright again uses the family image as a metaphor for the Scottish community, well spoken in a variety of registers. For instance, in the original, Koolighin warns Olga about the coming of the drunk doctor Chebutykin in a very plain/neutral straightforward way:

Koolighin: The doctor's got drunk just as if he'd done it on purpose.  
Hopelessly drunk.... I am going to hide myself... what a scoundrel! Olga: He's  
been off drinking for two years, and now suddenly he goes and gets drunk.

Chebutykin: (glumy) The devil take them all... all the lot of them! They think I  
can treat anything just because I'm a doctor, but I know positively nothing at  
all. I've forgotten everything I used to know. I remember nothing, positively  
nothing.  
(1994, p. 298)

Lochhead's rendition of the same scene is:

Coluquhon: Chisholm! Old So-and-So! You'd think he'd done it on purpose [laughs] The Doctor picks tonight of all nights to go on the batter and get himself totally sozzled! ... I am keeping out of his road!

Livvy: Stays on the wagon for two years then chooses the one night he might be of some use to – fall off?

Chisholm: To Hell with the whole damn lot of them! They think just/because I'm a Doctor I can cure everything, but I can't! / What was it Christ said – 'it's not the sick who need the doctor, it's the doctor needs the doctor!' Know nothing about anything...  
(Act III, p. 62)

The use of colloquialisms and slang brings bigger emotionality to the text and places Chisholm as one of the family members, but at the same time the language narrates violence too as a marker of emotional suffering.

Lochhead applies such interpretations of Britishness predominantly in her versions of the Greek plays. In *Medea*, the family is not only dysfunctional but also a divorced couple since the central motif behind the adaptation was the cultural reflection of the newly devolved Scotland, with a specific focus on the inner cultural climate. In *Thebans*, Lochhead represents the royal family as dysfunctional and its male members in militant guises. However, the melodramatic tone of Lochhead's reading of Chekhov is enforced with the inserted Calvinistic views about sexuality, in the sense of negation/suppression of desires, by the male cast, of which the only self-conscious character is Andrew.

Vera Gottlieb views Chekhov's comedy as the disparity between desire and fulfilment, or in other words: 'In most cases, there is little to stop the characters from doing what they want – except themselves (2000, p. 231). This characteristic of Chekhov, Lochhead has appropriated as a form of a social satire or self-satire in the fashion of MacMolière adaptations.

The original play written in 1900 was defined as drama by its author. Scholars found a lot of common traits with comedy. Gottlieb also considers the play a comedy in which the disparity between desire and fulfilment is brought in with the help of

verbal and dramatic techniques: such as antithesis, parody, farce, the incongruous or the grotesque, deflation of character at a moment of 'drama' or self-dramatisation, and through the undercutting or defusing of atmosphere and the acceleration/deceleration of rhythm and pace (2000, p. 237). Very often a Chekhov character, in the opinion of the same critic, approximates Molière's *Tartuffe* (2000, p. 237). Therefore, Lochhead's approach approximates the adaptation of *Tartuffe* fifteen years before the year of Chekhov's adaptation in terms of adaptation techniques and faithfulness to the original with emphasis on the grotesque. It also reflects the self-colonised image of the coloniser in the theory of Gilbert defined in her post-colonial drama with the ironic remark of over exaggerated self-importance of the ruling class.

Gottlieb identifies Chekhov's interest in demonstrating human absurdity but in a realistic context in order to show how 'human behaviour struggles with itself in a defined society' (2000, p. 237). Devlin also defines Lochhead's goal as an attempt to reveal the human, universal characters and motifs in the play. However, they are not organic, as already mentioned but very often bear contradictory features, presented through constant jump in and out of character (the sisters only) in order to comment and reveal the performative function of social constructs such as national/ cultural and gender identities.

Devlin (who performed Milly in the 2000 production of the Royal Lyceum Theatre in Edinburgh) describes her character as a very physical and visceral; a frustrated artist, who is also very human. Devlin approached Milly in a straightforward way to explore her humanity. The physicalisation of the character starts from the text – Milly's words 'I want to be alone' are Greta Garbo's. Milly is aware of the movie queens, therefore she performs Garbo with a slightly glamorous quality, who shows sardonic humour. Just like the movie stars of the 1940s, she also smokes, i.e. the director introduced also some of the 1940s cinematic effects to intensify the truthfulness of the historical presence of the character. Or perhaps, on the contrary, with Kristeva's idea of the abject in mind, Milly, as the strongest artistic presence in the story, doubles the social suffering. As a narrator and holder of unbearable identity

she gradually moves into crying out the theme of suffering-horror, which is often decried with maximal stylistic intensity. Furthermore, Kristeva claims:

If one wished to proceed farther still along the approaches of abjection, one would find neither narrative nor theme but a recasting of syntax and vocabulary – the violence of poetry, and silence. (1982, p. 141)

Milly's poetic image could be traced back to a poem by Lochhead titled 'Lady Shalot' (2005, p. 119). In it, the protagonist is only fifteen, 'moons in the mirror' and 'swears that she will never/ lead a bloody boring life like theirs' (2005, p. 119). The reflection in the mirror is unclear 'ingenue or harlot?' which as the poem progresses turns to be a passive woman trapped in desires to be wanted and unable to pass through the looking glass (2005, p. 120).

In the words of Devlin, Lochhead stated that Chekhov should not become a museum piece and that she thought that there was some kind of connection between the Scottish and Russian sensibilities (a kind of openness, reminiscence and melancholy), contrary to the reserved mentality of the English. Devlin slips into a childhood memory:

I remember as a kid I would be asked to sing a Scottish song and there will be a granny in the corner saying 'o, it was a really good cry' – a kind of sentimentality and a willingness of to be emotional and that gathering and sharing stories and past that Liz saw was quite akin to the Russian mentality. (Devlin 2012)

Perhaps Lochhead's source of the comic as disparity between desire and fulfilment, described by Gottlieb as a Chekhovian feature, is rooted in the sentimentality and willingness to be emotional. This is also revealed with the use of spoken language, hence more emotional in the view of Kristeva but also a profuse use of slang which lead to abjection – unfulfilled desire dispersed with sentimentality which nourishes the melodramatic.

The directorial input, in the words of Devlin, was passionate, vocal, and straightforward: 'Cownie really wanted to get to the heart of the truth of the world of the women'. One of the trickiest moments in the memories of Devlin is the end of the play, because 'there was not a point to tell an actor what were the author's intentions

or themes. The Chekhovian plays are not very easily identifiable, so that's why it was difficult to find an end' (Devlin 2012). Perhaps that is what exactly Lochhead has attempted to narrate in her version: the impossibility of coming to an end with the current cultural situation as an observation and comment on the national identity debate. However, there were no contemporary cultural references or themes that informed the directing of the play apart from the sense of Scottish insular problems, small town mentality and the family as a microcosm of society. In the words of Devlin, Natasha is almost a comical character, who engages more with the local community than the others but this could be also interpreted as part of the class issue.

In term of reception, the actress remembers that some women complained that in the late 1940s women would have been more proactive thus suggesting that the play was perceived as a direct representation of the historical past rather than critically analysed. In the same vein, the director also failed to interpret the subtleties in the play suggested by the playwright. In the opinion of Devlin, the purpose of the adaptation was to give a Scottish voice to the classic and drawing closeness between Scottish and Russian sensibilities (Devlin 2012).

The reviewer from *Scotland on Sunday* (2000) considers it a successful transposition, given that *Three Sisters* is one of those of Chekhov's plays hard to reinterpret in contemporary context, particularly because of its end. The end in the original marks a very significant historical moment of 1901 with great social change of the old order with a new one. According to reviewer Mark Fisher for *The Herald*, the ending was a significant drawback in the production: 1946 is missing the tragic resonance of Tzarist Russia at the beginning of the twentieth century (Fisher 2000). Devlin also finds the ending puzzling but from the perspective of historical verisimilitude:

after the war many young girls found work as land girls, whereas 'in the play the way the women were stuck seemed odd – where has women's liberation gone? (Devlin 2012)

McMillan supports Fisher's concerns about the loss of the emotional depth and elegiac sense of decay in Chekhov by Lochhead with its weak replacement of Britain in 1946 and adds:

Of course, there is a right-wing narrative of British history that suggests our civilisation went to pot after 1945, and passionately mourns the loss. (McMillan 2000)

This, in the view of the same critic, leads to a loss of dramatic content, which results in melodramatic or farce moments, especially vivid in the staging:

When Chekhov's play is darkest and the characters most distraught Cownie's production sometimes seems to lose its rhythm, and to drift towards melodrama or farce. (McMillan 2000)

The melodramatic/farce tone is sustained also through the application of irony in the female characterisation as already discussed earlier in the chapter, due to the applied interpretation of the text as monumental history by the playwright.

Fisher admits that the play does not narrate the historical truth, for instance:

the American soldier is stationed in Scotland for longer than is historically likely, and it's not clear why so many people should be hanging round the Philipson (formerly Prozorov) house... (Fisher 2000)

However, he admires Lochhead's skill to give a truthful image of the class divisions and social values of the period. In other words, what Lochhead achieves is to blur the borderline between the real (historical) and fictional experiences so that the theatre space transforms from metaphorical, symbolic space, into metonymic, i.e. the foreign body refers to the physical body of the coloniser. It is a traditional way of presenting the cultural split in Scottish theatre but Lochhead has inscribed two foreign bodies (English and American) and two female points of narration based on class difference (Lehmann 2006, p. 151).

Anne Varty claims that in *The Big Picture* (1988) for Dundee Rep Theatre, Lochhead mixes the cinematic with theatrical, to bring a closeness to the audience and sharing (slightly non-dramatic technique). Therefore she applies a different framing mixing the male gaze of cinema (in the dramaturgy/staging) with the classical maternal gaze of theatre (Varty 1993, p. 165).

Such a cinematic framing can be also found in the characterisation of Chekhov's *Three Sisters*, which, to a certain extent, speaks of similar thematic concerns as the

setting of *The Big Picture* in the same historical period of 1950s. The play performs the memories of Dorothy and Deanne, two schoolmates, and tells the story of their growth from girlhood to womanhood, and like many of her pieces in *True Confessions*, exhibits wry nostalgia for the popular culture of the era. The play was dedicated to the memory of Anita Loos (author of *Gentlemen prefer Blondes*) and explored the broken dreams of youth, set in a symbolic cinema by a broken proscenium arch and a giant Technicolor cloudscape (Varty 1993, p. 165).

Despite the similarities between the two works, the cinematic effect is brought in not by the thematic references such as the growth from girlhood to womanhood via class difference (Nettie and Irene), or to study the points of connection between past and present (the theme of nostalgia and the central point of past reference Oxford and present – Scotland) (lost in this sentence perhaps because of the ‘not’ early on in the sentence!). Despite the dynamic of the text being set thematically, Lochhead has communicated the big share of the undercurrent themes and emotions with the help of post-dramatic, non-narrative, devices such as poetry, music and dance to set up the scenes and historical context, characterisation and change in mood. This is due to the fact that the problematic of time is closely related to the problematic of space in the case with female subjectivity. The latter is defined by Plato as the matrix space, or *chora*, which is nourishing and unnameable, a *jouissance*, but it also is characterised with repetition and eternity in the view of Kristeva. The same leads to a massive presence of monumental temporality: ‘without cleavage or escape’ into an ‘all-encompassing and infinite like imaginary space’ (1981, pp. 16–17). Therefore, the whole action is dipped into such *chora* imaginary space, which is further analysed with the help of post-dramatic theatre of performance in the chapter.

The historical moment is established in the very beginning with Milly’s whistling of a popular 1942 song ‘Mares eat oats and does eat oats and little lambs eat ivy’ (a slightly silly but merry song) Act I, p. 2). Apart from the sisters, Chisholm and



Vanderbilt's memories of Oxford, the city is reinserted as poetic image with the help of Milly, who recites a stanza from Sir Alfred Tennyson's poem 'Oxford' (Act I, p. 8).

Although there aren't any direct references to war, the playwright used her musical skills to interpret the outside war as an inside war in the family, through a battle of tunes of popular American songs of the 1940s and traditional Scottish songs. For example, in Act III, Chisholm, Andrew and Nigel are in great mood in expectation of a concert for Burns Night; they start dancing and kissing together to the tune from the Oklahoma musical 'People will say we are in love' from 1943. Then the party looms into a wild dancing on the background of the Blue Danube Waltz. Nigel accompanies on the piano and Milly sings when suddenly interrupted by angry Nettie (pp. 49–50). After the interrupted Burns Night celebration, the airmen sing 'Good night Irene' to Irene. This is an American popular song from 1940s, followed by Nanny's traditional Scottish song 'Bonny wee thing' to little Bobby (Act III, p. 52). Sludden intrudes on the company celebrating Burns Night and after being rejected he slips into his 'Hen's march to the Midden' directed at Nigel as an act of protest and also jealousy (Act III, p. 65). The end of the music battle is a victory for the Scottish hegemonic voice in the last act – the Scottish tenor Robert Wilson with the song 'If I were a blackbird, I'd whistle and sing' (Act IV, p. 78), which is a dark ironic voice inserted by the playwright.

The only true love relationship, that between the Colonel and Milly, is also revealed with the help of non-narrative techniques, i.e. music and poetry, thus going beyond the symbolic space. It is intensified at the end when the actual scenes of separation take place. The separation, in the view of Kristeva, symbolises also the ultimate abjection that is usually revealed through 'the violence of poetry, and silence' (1982, p. 141). For instance, in the first scene of separation, Vanderbilt arrives to say that his camp is to be relocated. Everybody is sad, especially Milly, who sings a duet with Vanderbilt of 'The stars will remember' (a sentimental song) (Act III, p. 64). Later on, Vanderbilt ironically/self-ironically whistles softly the tune of 'The world may forget you as time passes by' (Act III, p. 71). In the next act, Milly is very distraught

and attempts at reciting Tennyson's 'The Lady of Shalot' but fails (Act IV, p. 90). This sense of confusion and symbolic loss correspond to the same idea about ultimate abjection, where language disintegrates into a nonsensical mix of syntax and vocabulary. Interpreted in the lines of post-dramatic theatre, this merge of text, voice and noise create a new frame of meaning, described as *soundscape* (Lehmann 2006, p. 159). Moreover, apart from collage and montage, the principle of polyglossia proves to be omnipresent in post-dramatic theatre. Multi-lingual theatre texts dismantle the unity of national languages according to the authors of post-dramatic theatre (Lehmann 2006, p. 147). The soundscape is not a new dramatic technique and skill used by the playwright. Similarly to the ending of *Medea*, and as a member of the group of the writers of the magnetic North, Lochhead applies the expanded notion of language as a social construct in order to give power to the semiotic over the symbolic. Kristeva's chora becomes omnipresent in the background of the play, which, according to the critic (Kristeva), is not symbolically present but transforms the text and the social. Such an effect is described by Lehmann as:

a *restitution of chora*: of a space and speech/discourse without telos, hierarchy and causality, without fixable meaning and unity. In this sense, we can say theatre is turned into *chora-graphy*: the deconstruction of a discourse oriented towards meaning and the invention of a space that eludes the laws of telos and unity. (Lehmann 2006, p. 145)

Further to the soundscape and reinsertion of the chora, Lochhead introduces a number of images that characterise with repetitiveness and prolongation of scenes, such as the music box dancer and Nettie as dancer, etc. She brings focus on 'image-time' perception, which according to the principle of post-dramatic theatre is a sign for play with dramatic time (Lehmann 2006, p. 157). The general thematic meaning of such dramatic time play can be interpreted as representation of the cultural identity as agony, establishing the overarching sense of immobility and uneasiness or suffering read as monumental history.

Compared with the previous adaptations of the playwright, *Three Sisters* differs significantly. It seems that Lochhead has diverged from her usual approach, namely that of reading the feminine as post-colonial subject. The adaptation builds upon the old linguistic model of cultural identity with the idea of anti-Englishness. This step

back is necessary for the playwright in order to reflect upon the idea of colonisation and the emergence of cultural imperialism that is directly linked to the idea of Britishness, in the male national model. Furthermore, the previously discussed language war discourse, suggested by Lakoff, could be revisited with the idea of contemporisation and shift from language to performance, in which language has been perceived in its broader sense in the view of the writers of the North – a music battle. Studied from the perspective of post-colonial drama, Gilbert claims that the combination of music with theatre multiplies the signifying power and contributes to the *mise-en-scene* to enhance the mood or atmosphere (2002, p. 194). It also denaturalises the action in order to divert the audience's attention to an alternative perspective, thus breaking the bonds of the conventional representation (2002, p. 194).

Furthermore, the suggested model of *MQS* cannot be applied directly for the evaluation of the current adaptation. Partly because the invisibility of the colonised female bodies speak of completely silenced female characters, who are either muted, inaudible or stay silent as a form of resistance. The re-inscribed sexual difference is subsumed by gender, therefore the theme of love is not replaced with the theme of sex. In the view of Reizbaum, such reading reveals national identity experienced as an inner psychological struggle, narrated in its intensity through the character of Milly as the artistic voice in the community and the double experience of abjection as the voice of the muted, uncanny or unspoken. Therefore, the narrators' perspective (the three sisters) is constructed under the male gaze, which is also split (two-faced Mother), while the colonised body is invisible (overlooked, in the sense of under looked offered by Gilbert) or silenced. The narrative relies on post-dramatic techniques, music, soundscape and others in order to give a choradramatic voice to the characters who appear trapped between the cruel present and the blissful past memories. Despite that, the family also becomes the metaphoric expression of British identity and the genders are undermined in the same way as in the other adaptations. Women are the stronger sex and are more materialistic/practical, men are the weaker sex and more romantic in their views), and all female cast are objectified by the phallic culture. The difference is that women hold non-Scottish traits of female

objectification. The images are romanticised: Irene is the idolised pure/divine body; Milly is the dark, mysterious but also very attractive woman, almost femme fatale; Livvy is the androgynous in the sense of sexless body, and Nettie is the motherly body. All of these, in the classification of Kristeva's phallic mother, represent the ecstatic, i.e. the female body forced to adopt the dominant male language. The lack of the totemic presentation of women in the Calvinistic traditional perceptions, present in the rest of the adapted plays by Lochhead, is intentional: the female sexuality is not objectified under the Scottish male gaze but under the foreign, outsider's gaze of the American soldiers. Additionally, the infidelity of both married women (Milly and Nettie) driven by their love and lust for other men is not interpreted in the context of cultural betrayal as part of the national debate but only speak of unhappy marriages: both women step outside their home to seek personal happiness. In such a way, the playwright rewrites the modern classic into the established trend of reading the new cultural identity after Devolution as a dialogue between the national and the international and suggests 'exorcist' solution to the gender/sex misinterpretation by studying individual women's experiences.

In conclusion, Lochhead's retelling of Chekhov's play *Three Sisters* is a domesticated, free and, questionably, faithful adaptation to the original. In fact, formally the adaptation is faithful but not in its inscribed, new meanings.

The main motivation for transposing the action in Scotland completely resonates with Pavis' concept of intraculturality or self-reflexivity with main reflection on the local, receptive culture. The choice to keep the text body intact and change the context to Scotland of 1940s (most unionists years according to Calder) in a small local community in the north east helps the dramatist to insert the national question, with a reflection on the modern cultural changes as a debate on the unresolved question of Britishness. The same choice corresponds to Fischer-Lichte's interpretation of cultural performance as a reading of transformation of cultural identities in Scotland. The play also inserts the Kristevian concept of transnationality as a valid reading of national identity after WW2 in Europe, and in compliance with the modern trend of interpreting the national question in post-devolution Scottish

theatre as a debate between the national and international. By attributing transnationality to the international in the cultural debate, Lochhead manages to retell the story from a woman's point of view as experience of non-linear, monumental, time. This has been perceived by most of the audience, performers and critics as problematic or has been wholly, or partially, dismissed due to the invisibility of the colonised subject which is also the narrator (the three sisters).

Lochhead's choice to leave the plot intact contributes to the dramaturgical post-dramatic approach of presenting the main subject as a conflict between body and word, i.e. foreign text (word) within Scottish context (body). Further, she has increased the suggested reading with the characterisation of the women in the play as exiles, marked by race and class, who are silenced both biologically (fatherless, orphaned) and socially (speakers of foreign/male languages). This according to Kristeva's concept of the fallen queen/phallic mother speaks of socially marginalized and silenced ecstatic bodies. The race and class markers show that the gender/sex difference is obliterated (Reizbaum), i.e. women are represented as the colonised body, which transferred to the national question debate speaks metonymically of colonised culture through colonised national language (the basic conflict between body and language). Further, the playfulness of registers in characterisations as in previous adaptation by the playwright, speak of socially constructed identities (class and language too), however in the chosen dramaturgical context of post-dramatic theatre it also reveals the deconstruction of national language. Further, Lochhead expands the original themes of fatherless family and dramatised identity crisis due to a lack of personal identity with the abjected, muted post-colonial subject who experiences the sociosymbolic contract against its body. The narrative of suffering is presented both through various silences, phonetic spelling, italicisation within the text, and language of violence expressed with forms of slang in the text. The spoken language based on colloquialisms contributed to bringing further intimacy and emotionality to the text approximating the local sensibilities. On a psychological level, the feeling of fear in previous adaptations has been driven to sensations of disgust, hatred and repulsion, which Kristeva explains with the internalisation of negation/abjection after 1960s. The lack of the phallic Father is replaced with the

choral, unnameable Mother. It is not present in the symbolic but affects it. Therefore, Lochhead adds soundscape, montage and post-dramatic time (image-time) in order to reintroduce Kristeva's concept of the chora, i.e. the semiotic as a voice of the local culture and the lack of the symbolic (language).

The female identity is interpreted with the image of the two-faced mother according to the theory of the abject by Kristeva. The two faces are – the artistic, intelligent and beautiful woman, and its complete opposite – the repulsive but also fascinating working woman. The split in the Mother image is inserted as a class difference. The three sisters are objectified with the Western ideology of the female, i.e. the mother, child and wife figure of the Christian Mary. The main function of the first face of the Mother is to question the male's rationality. The educated women's behaviour is often defined as hysterical and their appearance in the social space as a carnival puppet. In contrast, the working woman is unappreciative of art and beauty and successfully takes the role of the paranoid or murderous socialite, the role which Nettie performs in Lochhead's adaptation but not completely. However, apart from showing the marginalisation/abjection of the feminine by the paternalistic cultural ideology and the constructed female images (both classes change places and roles, accordingly) under the male gaze as a conflict between body and language, Lochhead also reads the Scottish cultural identity and the unsettled question of Britishness as experience of unbearable identity. In the theory of Kristeva, the boundary between object and subject is blurred, or to link it to the post-colonial discourse in previous adaptations by the playwright, the colonised and the coloniser merge.

Such a reading pushes the genre of the play from melodramatic into farcical reading of grotesque and self-ironised cultural images. The male gaze is split as the objectification of the female is done not only from Scottish, but also an American point of view, with the second being more prominent. Such a reading excludes the old link of the feminine with the uncanny in the Scottish national trope reading but it also subsumes sex into gender. Hence, the love theme has not been replaced by the sex one, but additionally sexual difference has been re-inscribed as equated to gender difference.

## References:

BASSET, K., 2000. 'Chekhov's trio travel well in Scotland'. Review of *Three Sisters* by Liz Lochhead. Royal Lyceum Theatre. Edinburgh. *The Telegraph*. [online]. 17 February. [viewed 10 July 2010]. Available from: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/4719879/Chekhovs-trio-travel-well-in-Scotland.html>.

BOLTON, L., 2012. *Transcript*. Interview by M. Paraskevova. 25 August.

CALDER, A., 1997. By the Water of Leith I Sat Down and Wept: Reflections on Scottish Identity In: H. RITCHIE, ed. *Acid Plaid: New Scottish Writing*. Bloomsbury.

CHEKHOV, A., 1994. *Plays*. E. Fen, transl. Penguin Classics.

DEVLIN, C., 2012. *Transcript*. Interview by M. Paraskevova. 15 May.

FISCHER-LICHTE, E., 2002. 'Dramatising the Identity Crisis' in *History of European Drama and Theatre*. London, NY: Routledge. pp. 257-264.

FISHER, M., 2000. A Review of *Three Sisters* by Liz Lochhead. Royal Lyceum Theatre, Edinburgh. *The Herald*. [online]. 14 February. [viewed 05 June 2012].

GONZALEZ, C. R., June 2004. An Interview with Liz Lochhead in *ATLANTIS* 26.1. pp. 101-110.

GOTTLIEB, V., 2000. Chekhov's Comedy In: GOTTLIEB, V. & P. ALLAIN, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to Chekhov*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 231-237.

HARVIE, J. & J. MCDONALD, 1993. Putting New Twists to Old Stories: Feminism and Lochhead's Drama In: CRAWFORD, R. and A. VARTY, eds. *Liz Lochhead's Voices*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. pp. 136-156.

KRISTEVA, J., 1982. *Powers of Horror*. [online]. Roudiez, L.N., transl. NY: Columbia University Press. [viewed 25 June 2014]. Available from: <http://www.csus.edu/indiv/o/obriene/art206/readings/kristeva%20-%20powers%20of%20horror%5B1%5D.pdf>

KRISTEVA, J., JARDINE, A. & BLAKE, H., 1981. Women's Time. *Signs*. [online]. vol. 7, No. 1 (Autumn, 1981), pp. 13-35. The University of Chicago Press. [viewed 07 February 2010]. Available from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3173503>.

KRISTEVA, J. & A. GOLDHAMMER, 1985. Stabat Mater. *Poetics Today*. [online]. Vol. 6, No. 1/2, 'The Female Body in Western Culture: Semiotic Perspectives'

(1985), pp. 133–152. Duke University Press. [viewed 08 April 2012]. Available from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1772126?origin=JSTOR-pdf>.

LEHMANN, H.T., 2006. *Post-dramatic Theatre*. Transl. K. Jurs-Munby NY & London: Routledge.

LOCHHEAD, L., 2005. Lady Shalot. *The Colour of Black and White*, Edinburgh: Polygon. pp. 119-120.

LOCHHEAD, L., 2000. *Three Sisters*. Unpublished script. Director Tony Cownie. Royal Lyceum Theatre, Edinburgh.

MARSH, C., 2000. The Stage Representations of Chekhov's Women In: GOTTLIEB, V. & P. ALLAIN, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to Chekhov*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 216-227.

MEYERHOFF, M., 2004. Doing and Saying: Some Words on Women's Silence In: LAKOFF, R. T., ed. *Language and Woman's Place*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 209-215.

MCMILLAN, J., 2000. 'Chekhov's elegy moves to a Scottish country schoolyard The Lyceum puts a brave British spin on a Russian masterpiece', Review of *Three Sisters* by Liz Lochhead. Royal Lyceum Theatre, Edinburgh. *The Scotsman*. [online].14 February. [viewed 05 June 2012].

REIZBAUM, M., 2005. Gender and Nationalism in Scotland and Ireland: Making and Breaking the Waves In: MCLLAVANNEY, L. & R. RYAN, eds. *Ireland and Scotland: Culture and Society, 1700–2000*, Four Courts Press. pp. 183-202.

SCOTLAND ON SUNDAY (Theatre). 2000. Review of *Three Sisters* by Liz Lochhead. Royal Lyceum theatre. Edinburgh. 20 February. [online] [viewed 05 June 2012].

VARTY, A., 1993. Scripts and Performances In: CRAWFORD, R. and A. VARTY, eds. *Liz Lochhead's Voices*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. pp. 149-164.



## Conclusion

Liz Lochhead's dramatic revisions reveal a complex reading of post-devolution Scotland. Arguably, they encompass a complete and controversial national debate established as a dynamic relationship between nationalism and internationalism. The playwright seems to cast a doubt upon established discourses by placing the feminine as the international, but also the foreign (asserted as *unheimlich* by the playwright), in order to reveal its controversies and question its representability. As result, the reformed cultural model transpired a demonising theme of Britishness, which corresponds to Pittock's (2001) remark about a narrowed interpretation of the internationalist concept by the Scottish post 1999.

Lochhead makes no secret of the fact that she has been a long term supporter of the anti-intellectual and performance poetry movement of the Liverpoolian poets from the 1960s. Her rejection of the cultural imperialism in literature and theatre means that in her work she imbues canonical dramatic texts with demotic dialects to emphasize the theme of decolonisation. She aims at producing Scottish versions accessible to wider public, which makes her share similar artistic goals to the ones of John McGrath and 7:84 Theatre Scotland. The use of vernaculars affiliates her work to the nationalist project of Morgan and Leonard but Lochhead is not concerned with the lowered status of Scots or interested in exploring the tragic form with the idea of using the indigenous language as a classical medium. Similarly to Morgan, her idiosyncratic stage Scots is as fictionalised (just as the one Morgan applies in his adaptations, for instance in *Phaedra* (2000)). The playwright follows her poetic path of re-signifying cultural and gender stereotypes, by treating the classics as mythological narratives (and in this sense also popular and universal stories), which she retells with either a female Scottish voice as a narrator (a persona in her poetry, a female, usually working class, voice in her drama), or a mythological, fictional and often androgynous character in a female form. The latter serves as a visualisation of the national sense of the Scottish as unconscious, which gradually evolves to an individualised image of the uncertain/foreign voice with the character of Tiresias in *Thebans*. The retelling of the stories is enacted always with the idea of reflection on

the contemporary cultural context and followed by a twist at the end. Lochhead's unique artistic position of being neither a nationalist, nor a feminist provides a very particular interpretation of the national identity question in post-devolution Scotland, which in the year after 2000 took a central political significance. Currently, the post-devolution concept is outdated with the newly pursued politics for Scottish Independence and the scheduled Referendum in September 2014. However, the proposed reading of the classical revisions offered by Lochhead echo important concerns in the debate suggested by Hardwick, namely that of a re-negotiation between political and national identities. The study suggested that Lochhead sees those as frequently confused in the cultural reading of the Scottish self. She further problematises them through the insertion of gender difference as equated sexual difference, thus defying their representation in the cultural mirror and showing them as self-satirical, disfigured and grotesque reflections.

The connection between Greek plays, Molière and Chekhov introduced by the playwright is an attempt to depict real contemporary characters. Lochhead applies Molière's idea of social mirrors and reinforces it with Euripides' view about reason being subordinate to passion, i.e. body is stronger than language. The same idea resonates with Chekhov's disbelief in the power of language to express real feelings and emotions, hence the concept of the separation of body and language in the original. Lochhead uses it in order to present the current cultural debate as a conflict between body and 'native' language, as a political power and expression of voice. This conflict also enforces the ambiguity in characterisation of female protagonists due to the clash between the character types in the old narratives and the reinscribed traits of real, contemporary characters. The greatest contribution of the playwright is her reading of politicised voices and the introduction of gender politics into the framework of identity politics, with a focus on the marginalisation and exclusion of women from the political debate.

Lehrner (2012) emphasizes the importance of a woman's voice in the Scottish national debate, in the context of post-colonialism, as a necessary disturbance to the silenced heterogeneous groups of class and gender. Lochhead achieves it through

inserting new thematic lines relevant to the contemporary Scottish scene into the original works. For instance, the dramatist often blurs the private with the public in order to undermine the dominant national discourses (as discussed in Chapter One), and to problematise the publicly accepted gender difference as a sexual inequality. The preoccupation with the theme of sexual inequality defines Lochhead as a supporter of the second wave of feminism, proponents of which believed in gender equality and considered sexuality, along with all other forms of identity, socially constructed. For example, in her adaptations of Molière, Agnes and Celia are thematically constructed by the dominant ideologies about femininity. The playwright uses two systems for marriage instructions in order to build the character of Agnes, while for the character of Celia, Lochhead resorts to the dominant feminist ideologies and their male perceptions. The characterisation is completed linguistically with the dominant psycholinguistic studies about female stereotypes constructed by various linguistic media, such as PC and sexist language for Agnes, and profane and sexist language for Celia.

The introduction of class and race assists the discourse of individualised subjects discussed by the playwright. The specific transnational reading of the cultural identity question reinforces the individualisation of the subject. Such feminism rejoins the archaic (mythical) memory (Greek versions of Lochhead), and the cyclical or monumental temporality of marginal movements in line with Kristeva:

The sharpest and most subtle point of feminist subversion brought about by the new generation will be situated on the terrain of the inseparable conjunction of the sexual and the symbolic, in order to try to discover, first, the specificity of the female, and then, in the end, that of each individual woman (*Women's Time*, p. 21).

The main conflict in all adaptations is established as a lack of the phallic father (fatherlessness), which symbolically is expressed through the act of the decapitation of Mary—still a dominant national trope of Scottish cultural identity. Kristeva's explanation within the history of Western Europe is that western culture fixates on the question of representation and exploits hegemonic looks at the female subject, i.e. materialises unequal power relations. In her exhibition in the Louvre, *Vision Capitals* (1998), the subject of decapitation is a feminine experience and marks the limit of the

visible, elaborating the corporeal concern of temporality in order to criticise the fixation on representation by western thought (Sjoholm 2005, p. 122). Moreover, it does not represent the unrepresentable as a veil, but instead changes the issue of representation from *what is seen* to *who is seeing* (the political subject) (Sjoholm 2005, p. 126).

Lochhead's contribution to the discourse of representation, thus reflecting Kristeva's main ideas, is that she revisits the cultural Calvinistic attitude towards women's sexuality and makes more transparent the problematic social identities of women in power. As mentioned earlier, the evaluation of the political subject offered by Lochhead is conducted with the help of the playwright's idiosyncratic national model, namely that applied in her play *MQS*. One of the reasons to approach the texts with this model lies in the problematic nature of the dichotomous image offered by Reizbaum (2005) as a metaphor for national identity: the dual image of the queen contain both Elizabeth the Protestant and Mary the Catholic (Kristeva's phallic mother). Both of them are perceived either as the monster/whore or the saint/angel by the phallic culture, which is a consequence of the feeling of fear often resulting in the act of negation/abjection of the feminine. The ecstatic manifests the negation of sexuality and transforms women into sexually undifferentiated androgynous beings, projected in invisibility of the colonised body, e.g. Celia in *Miseryguts*. The melancholic experiences the submission to the father as punishment, pain and suffering, inflicted upon the heterogeneous body rendered as a colonised body with increased visibility as in the case of Medea and Agnes (Kristeva 1981, pp. 27-28). Lochhead includes those gender discourses in her play *MQS* in order to comment and point at the contradicting and ambiguous history of Scotland. Seen from the perspective of the feminine, however, both characters, Mary and Elizabeth, are cultural exiles and their sexuality is denied by the patriarchal order. In a similar fashion, Medea's revolt as a cultural exile becomes a source of negativity. She openly pushes power to its limits and struggles with it, which turns her into a hysteric/melancholic woman. Celia, on the contrary, is a cultural insider, however, her sexuality causes disturbances that push away her love and portray her close to the

image of the melancholic (abjected) female body, which acts also as the narrator and the invisible colonised body.

The revision of *Three Sisters* focuses on the issues of class friction and post-colonialism based on race difference. In contrast to her previous adaptations, the playwright preserves the theme of love, however, the same sex difference concept is added as a layer to the characterisation process because the foreignness inside is inserted as a class difference in order to achieve similar state of character ambiguity as in the Chekhovian version. The female characters are ecstatic, i.e. their colonised bodies are invisible, which similarly to the characterisation of Celia and the rest of the female cast in *Miseryguts*, presents obliterated post-colonial cultural images in which race is linked to social class. Such a connection is problematised in Lochhead's readings of the Greek tragedies where, apart from the class-race correlation, race is also used to mark cultural difference. For instance, in *Medea*, race is linked to gender to define 'the exotic Other' as the extreme exile. In contrast, in *Thebans* the link between race and class serves to insert difference in power and discern the community from its rulers.

Further to thus, it also questions the symbolic with the character of La Corbie, The Chorus and also the narrator, who is ambiguous / androgynous and uses poetic Scots in order to relate the narrative to the folkloric traditions of the Scottish ballad and Scottish music. La Corbie is a subjectivised historical voice completed by the body of the musician on the stage and accompanied by a dancing body, which brings more visibility and audibility to the performance in *MQS*. The post-devolution characteristics of La Corbie in the tragedies, e.g. of The Chorus in *Medea* and Tiresias in *Thebans*, are collective and androgynous in form, in order to show the strong link with the phallic Mother. For instance, The Chorus in *Medea* is placed in a different temporal dimension and communicates only with Medea (the mother). In *Thebans*, Tiresias is androgynous but is not linked to the mother, or very close to the audience. As a voice it is ironised as the dominant historical presence of Westminster. In the comedies, La Corbie is more individualised and often feminised.

For instance, Celia and Georgette have strong links with the audience similarly to the pantomime characters as a traditional image of Scottish performative practices.

The national as part of the symbolic is often represented metaphorically with a narrative about a family, which is cursed or dysfunctional. The reverberation of the theme of unhappy marriage is used to infer the state of the political marriage of Scotland to the Union. This metaphor is stronger in the retellings of *Thebans* and *Three Sisters*, and problematises the question of Britishness as part of the national debate as ‘cultural imperialism’, questioning the modern notion of cultural hybridity in post-devolution Scotland. Lochhead further expands the topic by exploring the place of women in the national debate.

The recurrent theme of agony (characters such as Medea and Jocasta experience various levels of despair) is applied in order to reflect upon the questions of colonisation and self-colonisation in Scotland. Such developments correspond to Kristeva’s concept of the semiotic, which if completely negated by the symbolic (as in *Three Sisters* where the feminine is the ultimate ecstatic), the semiotic as motherly function does not cease to work and manifests itself through the chora (which still affects the symbolic). As a result, the female cultural image becomes a dominant national trope: femininity is either biologically ascribed as the role of motherhood or socially as the subordinate wife. The abjection of the feminine according to Kristeva is dictated by the fears of the phallic body and the gaze in the interpretation of Lochhead is a self-gaze (cautiously controlled by the playwright in the view of Phelan). For example, the satire in Lochhead’s versions of Molière’s texts is political and very often characterised as self-satire in the Scottish cultural context (both Arnolphe and Alex have grotesque features). The coloniser, or phallic body, is not always represented by the male characters, although predominantly they are caricatured by the playwright. For example, Nettie in *Three Sisters* has such a grotesque portrayal as a working class member. On the one hand, as a woman, she is perceived as the colonised body, defined primarily by her social image of the mother. On the other, she is also the coloniser who gradually takes power over the house and the servants. Equally valid is the statement that the colonized is not always

performed by a female character, for example the Chorus in *Thebans* or Arnolphe in *Educating Agnes*. In addition, the main characters in the revisions by Lochhead are more self-conscious, e.g. Medea and Jason in *Medea*, hence Freedman's idea about a controlled self-gaze and Lakoff's theory about political identities built linguistically, which the playwright asserts as a discourse of 'language war'.

In support of the concept of controlled self-gaze, very often the playwright resorts to non-dramatic (for instance cinematic) framing, in some of her plays both textually (*Miseryguts*, *Medea*, *Three Sisters*) and in performance (*Thebans* and *Educating Agnes*), in order to facilitate the meta-narrative and social mirror of the cultural self. The latter was described in previous chapters as, 'the gazer seeing oneself seeing', or the act of the returned gaze as a process of raised self-consciousness.

Similar to her earlier poetic and dramatic work, Lochhead approached all of the adaptations under scrutiny as stories, and twists their endings according to her main goal of rewriting the classical text. She introduces a storyteller, usually a female voice, predominantly working class and an insider, who performs the role of a trickster con-man figure in the comedies. This figure takes the ambiguous role of La Corbie in the tragedies, which often present a complex reading of the symbolic. The narrator is vital to the playwright's goal of relating the play to the contemporary cultural context via references at the end of the play. Additionally, the narrator is also the visualised performative voice of traditional pantomime practices in Scotland. This technique works well for all the plays by Molière, however, for *Medea*, *Thebans* and *Three Sisters* it does bring some difficulties in staging, especially with the big gap between the narrative and meta-narrative which Lochhead introduces as a comment to the main subject of the plays. In *Medea*, however, she has multiplied the narrator's voice to three: the Nurse, The Chorus and Jason, which introduces polyglossia and with it, the idea of colonised culture and loss of national (political) language. Furthermore, the narrators in this adaptation are not fully self-conscious the way Georgette or Celia are in the comedies. Along with the female narrators, Lochhead includes a male narrator in order to establish the phallic point of view. Neither the Nurse, nor The Chorus offer a complete and objective storyline, however,

The Chorus, as close to the voice of La Corbie in *MQS*, is the voice of the community shaped by the limitations of the local culture and still androgynous in the sense of a pre-Oedipal image. A similar meta-narrative Lochhead offers with the split image of the community voice in *Thebans*, where The Chorus is a direct personification of the cultural community. This shares some features of social immaturity and is visualised as colonised body. In addition, the prophet character of Tiresias also comments on the unconscious in that communal voice. This textual meta-narrative of narrators introduced by Lochhead at moments has transgressive effect on the main narrative and, sometimes, adds an additional layer of performance.

The transgression, or split in the speaking subject, in the Scottish cultural question is often experienced as foreignness inside. This foreignness is often defined by the theme of betrayal in the traditional cultural discourse in Scotland. Lochhead replaces and interprets this as sexual betrayal or discusses as a woman's character trait, namely, her infidelity, thus passing the fault and responsibility onto women. Such interpretation also stems from the gender difference and social inequality, in the view of Jackson and Scott, as an explanation how power hierarchy in western societies is constructed and works. It is also due to the insertion of the feminine or uncanny as the foreign body, perceived as a threat by the phallic body. In order to undermine it, Lochhead subverts gender roles on the basis of sexual differences and clichéd perceptions of character and linguistic traits of men and women. This turns Lochhead in one of the main contributors to the literary studies of Rezibaum and Lehner about the marginalisation of women in the post-colonial reading of the national debate in Scotland and Ireland.

The theme of colonisation and sexual exploitation of women is common for all adaptations and thus contributes to the post-colonial dramatic theory of Gilbert & Tompkins. It is informed with a meta-narrative and is metonymical for the local culture. The theme is also shown through the clyping images in characterisation, which often are presented as mirror images in order to narrate the cultural male perceptions of women adopted by women (aspects of female self-colonisation). The colonised body suffers from social invisibility; it is silenced on various levels:



women are silenced and invisible in the social picture as representation of the culture they are framed by. The male gaze brings visibility to their bodies (abjected/colonised), dramaturgically expressed via recurrent images of dolls and mirrors similarly to *MQS*'s theme of women and power in the cultural context. Those images, in the opinion of Harvie & McDonald, serve for thematic emphasis on representation and performance and often result not only in changing the meaning of the main texts but also in the changing of their contexts, as for instance, in *Blood and Ice*, Mary and Claire are represented as dolls and in mirrors (Harvie & McDonald 1993, p. 136). Lochhead applies this imagery repetitively in her adaptations always in a slightly variable place and with variable purpose, e.g. dolls as a meta-dramatic/performative device in *The Chorus* and the character of Glauke as the mirror image in *Medea*. Lochhead further emphasises on the centrality of the mirror and doll images in *Three Sisters*.

Along with the poetic devices, the playwright applies a range of post-dramatic techniques in order to add to the performative aspects of inscribed post-colonialism onto the colonised body, hence her work further contributes to the field of post-dramatic theatre. The dramaturgical manipulation of chronology is a seminal technique for Lochhead, who applies it with the idea of reframing the natural inferiority of women as socially constructed. As previously discussed, Lochhead offers a controlled gaze that exposes both the limits of language and image (poetry and cinema) along with the body of performance. For example, the visibility of the colonised body in *Agnes* and *Miseryguts* is increased at the expense of limited vocality. Agnes is not only colonised but also linguistically silenced and, in addition to Gilbert & Tompkins's two categories of silence - muteness and inaudibility - Lochhead introduces a third category: the subject refuses to speak. Gilbert & Tompkins claim that the sole application of post-colonial techniques is to show: "the ways in which the reinscription and self-representation colonised bodies translate into performative strategies" (Gilbert & Tompkins 2002, p. 204). The purpose of introducing the third category of silence, in the view of the critic, is to empower the post-colonial subjects and free them from the linguistic control of the dominant narrative. This as a theme informs Lakoff's discourse of 'language war', according to

which the main function of language to construct both individual and group identities is politically framed and reflects power relations as performative acts. The feminine is not always performed by the female body as is traditionally observed in post-colonial drama – The Chorus in *Thebans* is the colonised body of the community, which in performance is merged with the body of the coloniser (internal colonisation). Arnolphe, on the other hand, is both the coloniser and the colonised in *Educating Agnes*, serving as an example of self-colonisation. This is visualised with the means of the colonised female body of Agnes in the text and its racial image in performance emphasised by casting a black woman in the role in its first staging (*theatre babel* 2008). Therefore, Lochhead gradually moves away from post-colonial drama into socio-linguistics in order to throw more light on the dominant political identities that are being forged at the times.

Representation and the act of looking are material and objectificatory practices. The produced objectification can only exist within a system of inequality and would be inconceivable if such an inequality did not exist. As mentioned earlier, the main idea of the decapitation of the feminine is the fixation on representation, which in the cultural revision of the Scottish, stands for national identity. Kristeva argues that the identity concept is strictly Anglo-Saxon which builds its culture on the idea of sexual difference and preserves it with the means of abjection, i.e. every difference is excluded. Abjection, according to Kristeva, is linguistically expressed with language of hatred, slang and other displacement devices such as humorously applied images of the apocalyptic. In Lochhead, the choice of language is dictated by the idea of contemporary reflection of power, expressed with the means of representation of the abjected (usually addressed by the male to the female characters) in the plays. For example, Jason uses the language of hatred, the male cast in *The Three Sisters* uses a lot of slang, Arnolphe speaks with PC language but also one of hatred when he becomes enraged, etc.

In the discourse of post-colonialism, identity is constructed by the historical/political relations. Wole Soyinka highlights the complexity of post-colonial practices and discourses, particularly in challenging the boundaries of both aesthetic practices and

critical strategies when considering the interrelationship between ideology and performance. Such questions have often resulted in practitioners challenging ideas about authorship and representation, and the refusal to be colonised or contained by the text-based 'norms' of western theatre. This often has meant a turn to mixed art forms, utilising film, ritual, dance, music and visual arts (Gale & Deeney 2012, p. 517). Kristeva refers to this dimension of the chora in all processes of signification as the semiotic (different from the symbolic). All performative strategies transfer the linguistic site of resistance (considered a male space) to a performative one (a chora, a female space). The connection between identity and representation in Lochhead's adaptations, therefore, is narrated through the image of the sexually exploited orphaned exile. The colonised body as a carrier of the feminine, motherly function is different from the narrator who holds more individualised characteristics.

According to Anne Varty, Lochhead's subject matter remains the same – female characters and female psyche – however, she kept on experimenting with the dramatic form (Varty 1993, p. 148). This thesis argues that Lochhead has expanded her subject matter and along with her previous interest in the female character and psyche (as defined by Varty), the playwright has developed an interest in Scottish culture and the national debate, which take central place in her adaptations after devolution. In these adapted texts women are used as mimetic devices (mirrors) to reflect upon representations of cultural identities. This is due to the fact that:

Women, forced so often to observe than to participate, can become ruthless commentators on contemporary mores, both in their writing and what they bring to performing comic characters: character acting as a female forte. It is argued that while women can't or won't tell jokes, they excel at portraying a wide variety of ridiculous and eccentric women (Clune 1993, p. 76).

As previously discussed, from a psychoanalytical point of view, Scottish identity is partly unconscious, effeminate. Hence, there is a strong link with the maternal image – the pre-Oedipal gaze in which sexuality is suppressed. It could be also supported with the metaphoric use of children by the playwright in *Jock Tamson's Bairns*, *MQS*, *Shanghaied* and *Same Difference*. From the point of view of aesthetics (mimesis and representational theories in theatre), the female images could be

interpreted as mimetic devices (mirrors) that reflect distorted and deconstructed cultural images.

In *Mirror's Song*, a poem dedicated to the filmmaker Sally Potter, Lochhead gives a voice to the mirror which asks to be smashed, and describes how the woman trapped inside will smash back because, "without you she can't lift a finger" (Lochhead 1999, pp. 74-75). The poem ends with an image of a woman giving birth to herself. The cultural interpretation of the trapped woman resembles the image of the contemporary Scot, who is trapped in the Union marriage but cannot 'be' without Britain. It is also the main voice of the abjected in the Kristevan theory. The other recurrent image of dolls in Lochhead's drama helps to assert the exile outside the power matrix as powerless, however, he is constantly manipulated as an expression of Scottish politics, as described by Paterson, as constant adjustments to outside pressures and governing elites (1994, p. 181). This is also the source of the national belief in post-colonial Scotland, and is the choice of cultural institutions, their members, the Scottish elites and Westminster, rather than the common Scottish people.

The cultural split identity image expanded with the post-colonial discourse about the conflict between language and body is presented linguistically with stronger emphasis on performance. The language holds the power, it is male, rational and English (British), whereas the body is the feminine, weak and full of passion (Scottish), manifesting itself more often as semiotic, poetic language. In this basic model, Scottish society enters an unequal power relationship between two races, introduced as sexual difference by the playwright (male and female difference). The text-language is often transgressed with the help of meta-techniques to performance with a strong Scottish cultural voice of the body. The performed language and identities include a semiotic, non-verbal and non-linguistic part (the feminine/chora). The Union is often sardonically referred to as a dysfunctional, corrupted, unhealthy family. The persistent concept of continued oppression (inequality) after devolution is the Scottish interpretation and application of the term post-colonialism (in the sense of 'after colonialism,' with the idea of continued colonisation) as a raised

voice of discontent and difference. Further to this, Lochhead ironises and undermines the current cultural and political situation by exchanging the attributes of the two identities (British and Scottish) in order to show their performative character. Moreover, the re-asserted subject of agony and the recurrent topic of problematic Britishness as part of the split cultural image wrongly defined by gender difference (female national trope), appear as painful (*Educating Agnes, etc.*) and unbearable identities (*Three Sisters*) in the self-ironic dramatic mirrors by Lochhead.

Chapter One argued that the national identity debate in Scotland is a dynamic process of renegotiation of sovereignty. The main concepts of colonisation, self-colonisation and internal colonisation were explained with the rhetoric of liberty, equality and the rhetoric of loss as dominant discourses of Scottish nationalism. It introduced and discussed the current discourse of Scottish nationalism as post-colonial. The political and social scholarship of Michael Keating, David McCrone, Lindsay Paterson and the post-colonial writing of Neil Lazarus and Richard Young argued for a new political form of nationalism introduced in Scotland based on civic community formation, which was viewed as problematic in relation to the old ethnic model. The national model of Lochhead appeared as a problematic interpretation of the national myth about Mary Queen of Scots and was further applied as an evaluative tool of all of her adaptations of the classics from the post-devolution period. Her approach links nationalism to feminism, in a continuation of her poetic work, in order to deconstruct cultural and gender stereotypes from the perspective of female sexuality.

Chapter Two studied the cultural identities in the context of indigenous Scottish theatre from the times of its origin to the present. It reflected upon the constantly changing meanings of nation, myth and identity in Scottish theatre, prior to devolution. The cultural image in Scottish theatre characterised as split, masculine and dispersed with cultural myths. The 1970s brought postmodern aesthetics on the cultural scene and inspired further revisions of the cultural identity and of the linguistic medium, which led to a plurality of identities. Scottish cultural scholars such as Corbett attributed it to a multicultural Scottish identity. This identity, however, as the feminist rewritings in the 1980s showed, remained split and

masculine. In spite of the fact that it partially lost its culturally mythological consciousness due also to the new culturally dominant voice of the hardman, it kept its Calvinistic attitude towards women. The new civic community expressed its nationalistic aspiration with the post-colonial form of nationalism, which encompassed both national and international views. The theatrical interpretations of the new Scottish cultural identity were informed by Bhabha and Hall's theory of the subaltern and cultural hybridity. In the works of Scottish playwrights after the 1990s, the new cultural image also appeared to be masculine and internally split, but driven by the dynamics between the national and international selves within it. As a consequence, it brought experiences of displacement by the phallic culture. Most of the scholarship shares the belief that the change was a result of the political and social restructuring of the Scottish community with the dominant politics of individualism, which replaced the old 'egalitarian' community structures. Lochhead challenges those beliefs with her versions of classical Greek tragedies and confronts them as old cultural mythology.

Chapter Three narrowed down the exploration of the link between cultural and national identities in Scotland, in the context of dramatic adaptations of the European classics (Molière, ancient Greek playwrights, Chekhov, etc.). The group of adaptations were studied against the adaptation approach applied by Lochhead, and then in conjunction with the main function of adaptations for self-reflexivity described by Patrice Pavis in his theory on intercultural theatre. The two traditions of adaptation for the Scottish stage support the two national discourses defined in Chapter One. Nationalists such as Findlay, Corbett, Brown, Dunlop, Leonard and Morgan sought a way to expand the linguistic medium via decolonisation (de-anglicisation with application of vernacular forms) and to re-establish the tragic register (Morgan). Internationalists, on the other hand, continued to look into the importance of performance and cultural assimilation disguised as cultural openness/hybridity (Perry, Greig, Greenhorn, etc.). They would frequently present Scottish identity as the experience of both belonging and displacement, and explore the potential for dark comedy in the original works. Lochhead's adaptation work, however, cannot be placed in the nationalist tradition of translating into Scots,

despite her use of stage Scots. She seems to support decolonisation of the language, however, not from the nationalist perspective of cultural imperialism and lowered status of the indigenous language, but as a keen supporter of performance poetry and anti-intellectualism, which brings her closer to the second trend (internationalist) with her interest in performance. This proximity does not, however, allow for her inclusion in the second group of adaptors either, as her approach of formal transgressing of genre, plot and characterisation mirrors the process of establishment of the post-colonial cultural model in Scotland.

Chapter Four provided an analysis of Lochhead's adaptations of Greek tragedies after 2000. It introduced the main subject as the abjected feminine. *Medea* and *Thebans* are contemporary interpretations of the Scottish cultural identity. The nationalist view about post-devolutionary Scotland as a multicultural and open society was questioned with the character of Medea constructed with the central idea of race and sexual difference in the theory of Kristeva. *Thebans* challenged the internationalist view of Scottish society as being a democratic and culturally open hybrid, by presenting the internal conflict as a family war leading to oppression of the ordinary people (internal colonisation). At the heart of the conflict Lochhead introduced the brothers as twins in order to imply an assumed equality between the English and the Scottish as part of the British cultural identity Unionist interpretation. Along with the poetic, Lochhead applied a number of post-dramatic techniques in order to present the post-colonial national debate entirely as a body politics argument in which the verbal *agon* is transgressed into physical agony of performance.

Chapter Five critiqued Lochhead's post-colonial versions of two of Molière's plays. *Educating Agnes* (2008) and *Miseryguts* (2002) presented the feminine in the same discourse but with increased visibility of the colonised body and with a highly performative function of Scots. Both plays discussed the cultural topical issue of self-colonisation in the current political context. They further commented on feminist ideologies with the analytic tools of psycholinguistics. Deborah Cameron and Robin Lakoff's studies facilitated the linguistic construction of female identities and

established a discourse about the place of women in the private (Agnes) and public (Celia) spheres and presented as an oppressive relationship between the phallic and female bodies. As an adaptor of Molière's plays, Lochhead worked in the established MacMolière tradition started by Kemp, but with an idiosyncratic stage Scots different for each adaptation. The Scottish humour manifests in political self-satire of contemporary cultural images, however, her adaptations do not trespass the generic form of comedy, especially the form of British pantomime.

Chapter Six studied Lochhead's interpretation of the Chekhovian classical play *Three Sisters* with a focus on the question of cultural imperialism as part of the national debate in the current context and its relation to gender and class. Lochhead's reading touched upon all aspects of the national debate identified in Chapter One for both rhetoric trends, i.e. colonisation, self-colonisation and internal colonisation. She presented a close and complex picture and changing class relations based on the old linguist contrast between English and Scottish, but expanded with American neo-colonial aspirations of the upper class members. The discourse of sexual difference in the previous adaptations of Lochhead received an additional development with a discourse of dramatic representation in the strict interpretation of Fischer-Lichte's theory about European drama and theatre. It was read as a gap between language and body, which Lochhead sets into play/performance with the use of post-dramatic techniques. In this adaptation, the playwright digs deeper in the concept of self-colonisation and not only ironises the past national identity ideas, but also demonstrates the process of self-colonisation through the adoption of new language and cultural dress (the cultural imperialism mythology) from both upper class and working class perspectives. The latter turns them from being colonised into a coloniser, and the former from colonisers into invisibly colonised bodies, full of nostalgia about a fictional, non-existent past.

Lochhead showed an exquisite ear for the changes in the political languages and reflected it appropriately in her adaptations. For instance, 2003 proved critical for the newly devolved Scotland as the activity of the public voice for the new Parliament elections showed a very poor result compare to 1999 due to the continued leading



role of Labour party government. 2007, however, revived the national question and rhetoric about independence, with the victory of the Scottish National Party in the General Elections for the first time in Scottish history. In the previous year a new cultural icon appeared: the first National Theatre of Scotland, which led to further inquiries into and redefinitions of Scottish identity. In the years after 2006 the debates about Scottishness did not cease and the newly formed National Theatre and its programme received both praise and criticism. Although the popularity of Scots language faded after Devolution, it experienced a new revival in 2012. This was partially influenced by the SNP and the Referendum plans, and partially instigated by cultural projects (like the one offered by the Royal Shakespeare Company in order to celebrate the anniversary of its establishment and encourage productions of Shakespeare to be performed in indigenous languages by amateur, community theatre formations).

During the research process, there were a few unexpected turns and events that brought expansion of the body of analysed playtexts and methods, as well as changes of perspective. Initially, the project targeted a complete analysis only of two of the plays, *Medea* and *Educating Agnes*, as representative of the two dominant adaptation discourses of MacMolière, or the comedy genre, and the Greek plays, or the tragic from, on the Scottish stage. All the other adaptations were going to be used as supportive texts where necessary. The defined broad adaptation framework proved problematic in terms of applying evaluation to the adapted texts. This brought about the introduction of a creative text, *MQS*, as the national model of characterisation. With it, the whole major framework of interpretation shifted from theatre adaptation into the post-colonial framework and post-feminist critique for which the previously developed framework of analysis fitted well and expanded the argument. This was the case particularly with the writings of Kristeva about motherhood and the phallic mother as a psychological projection of the Celtic queen figure in the study of Rezbaum that is both punished and celebrated by the Scottish culture (the sinner and the martyr). With this established new model for analysis, the body of analysed texts increased with the idea to test and reflect upon its functionality and development in post-devolution adaptations of the classics by Lochhead. Lochhead's reading of Chekhov's *Three Sisters* challenged the *MQS* model with its flexible power

relationships and invisibility of the feminine. In response, Fischer-Lichte's concept of cultural performance along with some of the performance aesthetics of post-dramatic theatre were introduced in order to further the analysis of the plays. The expanded theoretical approach also allowed the identification of the motifs behind the playwright's mode of adaptation (which has caused a lot of disturbance among the theatre critics and left the audiences with mixed feelings). The post-dramatic theatre theory also threw further light on the problematic issue of identity representation in Lochhead's in her earlier works. Although this issue has been identified by scholars like Harvie and Varty, a meaning beyond the concept of socially structured language and identity, and subjectified meanings presenting the dominant gaze, had not previously been provided. While analysing and summarising the adaptation techniques for the characterisation of the female cast in Lochhead's texts and their performances on stage, I was struck by the idea that they were not only problematised with the idea of stopping the nationalistic discourse of betrayal expressed through the beheading of the queen as suggested by Reizbaum, or Lehner's argument about female marginalisation in the cultural post-colonial Scottish scene. Since the recurrent images constantly applied by the playwright were dolls and mirrors, it referred to a male symbolic world of images and a feminine experience of cultural identity. This idea let me to the assumption that the cultural images are not direct representations but distorted images through female characters that served as mirrors, i.e. the writer used not metaphoric but metonymic connections to build the meanings in the stories, interpreted as a site of feminist aesthetics. This concept made me look back at the whole thesis and try and identify further links to the cultural identity readings of the plays and their particular motivations. The next change I applied was to view the post-colonial discourse in politics and social history as well as theatre, and then to relate it to the rest of the study. This shifted the main framework of the project again towards nationalisms in Scotland and proved to be a fruitful context for the analysis of the chosen body of playtexts. It allowed me also to place the writer's voice as different from the nationalist and later on feminist discourses. It also supported the main argument about the socially structured identities of gender and culture as one of the guiding beliefs of Lochhead, and further

helped me to justify the choice of language and dramaturgy for each specific adaptation and to explain the variations in the main model.

In terms of applying other avenues of research of the current project and any further developments, here are a few suggestions. Lochhead's model could prove fruitful as analytical tool for studying other contemporary woman playwrights' works in Scotland and beyond, not from the writer's national model point of view (*MQS*), but with a focus on the comic approach and gender subversion through re-signification, which in the opinion of Braun-Hansen is, "a fruitful model for identity in general" (2006, pp. 76 and 79). Another approach would have been to look at the whole thesis from the perspective of representation in post-dramatic theatre, its links to adaptations of the classics and the political, in order to reflect upon the cultural/national identities in the contemporary Scottish context. Useful sources could be the unpublished thesis of Samuel Bicknel, *(Re)presenting Drama: Adaptation in Post-dramatic Theatre* (2011); *Post-dramatic Theatre and the Political: International Perspectives on Contemporary Performance* by Jerome Carroll et al. (2012) and Hans Ties Lehmann's book, *Post-dramatic Theatre* (2006). The adaptations could be approached with the main idea of evolving a performative aesthetic in which the text of the drama is put in a special relation to the material situation of the performance and the stage. In other words, post-dramatic theatre is striving to produce an effect amongst the spectators and does not necessarily need to remain true to the text. Lochhead is not a radical case compared with the examples of The Wooster Group (New York City), Isla van Tricht (York), who also produce adaptations of classical works (e.g. The Wooster Group's *Brace Up!* after Anton Chekhov's *The Three Sisters*). In Lochhead, however, the defined focus of performance aesthetics involvement, which (as defined above) brings immediacy of relationship between text and audience, could be viewed as a further development of the pantomime style of performance on the Scottish stage.

On the other hand, the subject of the thesis could be seen as a complex relationship between translation and theatre adaptation studies and the political, although it could be interpreted also as a slightly distanced approach. It seems valid in the Scottish

context, however, as much of the theatre produced in Scotland discusses the national identity question in one form or another.

Part of the discussion in the thesis included the latest discourse of transnationalism, which could lead to a new avenue of research of the issues of national and political identities in the local culture.

In conclusion, the thesis studied the adapted works of Lochhead after devolution with the leading idea that she is neither a nationalist, nor a feminist, which proved to be a fruitful stand for the analysis of Lochhead's revisions of the cultural identities in the years between 2000 and 2008. The playwright's artistic beliefs – that all identities are products of social and political contexts – and her strong roots in poetry and performance facilitated the process of female characterisation in her work and the concise deconstruction of the national mythology surrounding the formation of such identities with precision and light-hearted humour.

The current political climate around the Scottish Referendum in 2014 and claims for political independence with increased nationalistic sentiments and the leading political role of the Scottish National Party makes the cultural revision Lochhead offers in her adaptations after 2000 worth consideration. In addition, if, as Braun-Hansen argues, the identity re-signification applied by Lochhead in the poststructuralist framework of Kristeva does not lead to a new identity reading, it does explore the parodic gaps in the national mythologies and causes cultural disturbance in the view of Rezibaum. The main task the playwright sets in her adaptations after devolution, confirmed by the findings of the current thesis, is her contribution to the cultural reading of contemporary Scottish identities by focusing the public attention on the contrived post-colonial national model as holding the traits of the old phallic model and transferred self- and internal colonisation tendencies. The increased cultural confidence and self-consciousness, reflected in the building of the cultural images by Lochhead, are critically studied and deconstructed through the application of performative language of resistance of the female/effeminate bodies. These bodies challenge the unstable status of the phallic body whose power, as the study also suggests, is reinserted through politically

charged language. Lakoff's discourse of politically performed identities becomes central to Lochhead's interpretation of the constantly re-visited and frequently unstable political and national identities with meticulous precision of the linguistic subtleties and changes occurred in the political space. The main subject of the study – female voice in the local culture – appeared silenced and most of the times excluded from the political debate for national identity in Scotland. However, the same subject in the cultural interpretations of Lochhead performed the third type of silence according to the post-colonial dramatic theory of Gilbert and Tompkins, in order to disrupt the link between gender and culture as experienced difference in the national debate and re-inscribe its political 'voice' as a speech/act, or site of silent but also visible resistance.

The thesis research question included the issue of gender and culture relation and how thus relation informs the national question in Scotland. The current study answered the question to a certain extent – it confirmed the appropriation of the queen image as a national trope and the subsumed sexual by gender in the national rhetoric of Scotland as suggested by Reizbaum (2005) and further developed by Lehner (2012). However, Lochhead's revisions stretched beyond it, by offering re-significations of political identities. There is no singular interpretation of these political identities, which confirms the previous scholarship by Mugglestone and Paterson, which suggested that Lochhead's reading of the cultural identities is complex and very often non-straightforward. However, due to the commonly recurrent theme of Britishness and agony in them as a conflict between body and language, a possible interpretation could be drawn with a reference to the last analysed play *Three Sisters* in which the root of the conflict is in the lack of a personal identity as a consequence of an authorial father figure in the family. Possibly, Lochhead also depicts such a weak cultural identity due to a constant reference to a link with the mother image as a non-symbolic presence. However, the same cultural revision of Chekhov could also be a reference towards a weak (unstable) political voice of the Scots in the undercurrent political battles for cultural self-assertions. The post-colonial dramatic techniques and feminist aesthetics supported Lochhead in introducing higher visibility but left the subject silenced or

voiceless. Further studies of the playwright's adaptations with a focus on identifying stronger political voices, especially with the prospect of the coming Independence, could lead to expansion of the current thesis and enlightening outcomes.

In a nutshell, the playwright's place in Scottish theatre and drama has been identified as a major contributor to developing the traditions of Scottish comedy writing and adapting classical European plays through the medium of an authorial stage Scots. Additionally, by fusing poetry and drama, her idiosyncratic approach has resulted in cultural performances (Fishcer-Lichte) of Scottish gender and culture in theatre and informed the discourse about women in Scottish theatre and their role as adapters. Lochhead's interpretation of the national debate and its dramatic representations along with her interests in individualised female cultural experiences contributed to the discourse supported by Reizbaum and Lehner, which in essence connects feminism to post-colonial nationalism and speaks of marginalised identities. Lochhead's approach to this discourse was introduced through the non-feminist ideas of Kristeva about the mother figure and her functions in western ideologies as a social construct. The playwright further demythologised the gender difference linguistically (language is also ideologically constructed) through the political and performative theory about language of Lakoff. As a humorous retort, to the excluded female voice from the male national rhetoric, Lochhead attributes it the power and will to leave the symbolic as a sign and act of performative resistance and incessant poetic/semiotic presence.

References:

CLUNE, J., 1993. Hearing Voices: Monologues and Revues In: CRAWFORD, R. and A.

VARTY, eds. *Liz Lochhead's Voices*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. pp. 75-92.

FREEDMAN, B., 1990. Frame-Up: Feminism, Psychoanalysis, Theatre In: CASE, S. E., ed. *Performing Feminisms: Feminist Critical Theory and Theatre*. Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press. pp. 58-66.

GALE, M.B. & J.F. DEENEY, 2012. *Routledge Drama Anthology and Sourcebook from Modernism to Contemporary Performance*. Routledge. pp. 55-805.

GILBERT, H. & J. TOMPKINS, 1996 (2002). *Post-colonial Drama*. London: Routledge.

HARVIE, J. & J. MCDONALD, 1993. Putting New Twists to Old Stories: Feminism and Lochhead's Drama In: CRAWFORD, R. and A. VARTY, eds. *Liz Lochhead's Voices*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. pp. 124-147.

JACKSON, S. & S. SCOTT, eds. 1996. *Feminism and Sexuality*. Edinburgh University Press.

KRISTEVA, J., Autumn 1981. Women's Time. *Signs*. [online]. vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 13-35. The University of Chicago Press. [viewed 07 February 2010]. Available from: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3173503>.

LEHNER, S., 2012. *Subaltern Ethics in Contemporary Scottish and Irish Literature: Tracing Counter-Histories* Palgrave Macmillan.

LOCHHEAD, L., 1999. *Bagpipe Muzak*. London: Penguin Books.

PATERSON, L., 1994. *The Autonomy of Modern Scotland*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

PITTOCK, M.G.H., 2001. *Scottish Nationality*. Palgrave.

REIZBAUM, M., 2005. Gender and Nationalism in Scotland and Ireland: Making and Breaking the Waves In: MCLLAVENNEY, L. And R. RAY, eds. *Ireland and Scotland: Culture and Society, 1700-2000*. Dublin; Portland, OR : Four Courts Press. pp. 183-202.

SJOEHOLM, C., 2005. *Kristeva and the Political*. Routledge.

VARTY, A., 1993. Scripts and Performances In: CRAWFORD, R. and A. VARTY, eds. *Liz Lochhead's Voices*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. pp. 149-164.



## Appendix

### Literal translation of *L'Escole des Femmes* by Ajay Stephen

#### ACT I,

#### Scene I Chrysalde, Arnolphe

Chrysalde: -You have come to marry her, you say?

Arnolphe: -Yes, I mean to settle the business tomorrow.

Chrysalde: -We are here alone, and I think we can speak together without fear of being overheard. Do you wish me to open my heart to you like a friend? Your plan makes me tremble with fear or you. To take a wife is a rash step for you, whichever way you consider the matter

Arnolphe: -True, my friend. Possibly you find in your own home reasons why you should fear for me. I fancy that your own forehead shows that horns are everywhere the infallible accompaniment of marriage.

Chrysalde: -These are accidents against which we cannot insure ourselves; it seems to me that the trouble people take about this is very ridiculous. But when I fear for you, it is on account of this raillery of which a hundred poor husbands have felt the sting. For you know that neither great nor small have been safe from your criticism; that your greatest pleasure, wherever you are, is to make a mighty outcry about secrets intrigues-

Arnolphe: -Exactly. Is there another city in the world where husbands are so patient as here? Do we not meet with them in every variety, and well provided with everything? One heaps up wealth, which his wife shares with those who are eager to make him a dupe; another, slightly more fortunate, but not less infamous, sees his wife receive presents day after day, and is not troubled in mind by any jealous twinge when she tells him that they are the rewards of virtue. One makes a great noise which does him not the slightest good; another lets matter take their course in all meekness, and, seeing the gallant arrive at his house, very politely takes up his gloves and his cloak. One married woman cunningly pretends to make a confident of her confiding husband, who slumbers securely under such a delusion, and pities the gallant for his pains, which, however, the latter does not throw away. Another married woman, to account for her extravagance, says that the money she spends has been won at play; and the silly husband, without considering at what play, thanks Heaven for her winnings. In short, we find subjects for satire everywhere, and may I, as a spectator, not laugh at them? Are not these fools—

Chrysalde: -Yes; but he who laughs at another must beware, lest he in turn be laughed at himself. I hear what is said, and how some folks delight in retailing what goes on; but no one has seen me exult at reports, which are bruited about in the places I frequent. I am rather reserved in this respect; and, though I might condemn a certain toleration of these matters, and am resolved by no means to suffer quietly what some husbands endure, yet I have never affected to say so; for, after all, satire may fall upon ourselves, and we should never vow in such cases what we should or should not do. Thus, if by an overruling fate, some natural disgrace should ever

happen to my brow, I am almost sure, after the way in which I have acted, that people would be content to laugh at it in their sleeve; and possible, in addition, I may reap this advantage, that a few good fellows will say "What a pity!" But with you, my dear friend, it is otherwise. I tell you again you are running a plaguy risk. As your tongue has always persistently bantered husbands accused of being tolerant; as you have shown yourself like a demon let loose upon them, you must walk straight for fear of being made a laughing-stock; and, if it happens that they get the least pretext, take care they do not publish your disgrace at the public market-cross, and—

Arnolphe: -Good Heaven, friend, do not trouble yourself. He will be a clever man who catches me in this way. I know all the cunning tricks and subtle devices which women use to deceive us, and how one is fooled by their dexterity, and I have taken precautions against this mischance. She whom I am marrying possesses all the innocence which may protect my forehead from evil influence.

Chrysalde: -Why, what do you imagine? That a silly girl, to be brief—

Arnolphe: -To marry a silly girl is not to become silly myself. I believe, as a good Christian, that your better half is very wise; but a clever wife is ominous, and I know what some people have to pay for choosing theirs with too much talent. What, I go and saddle myself with an intellectual woman, who talks of nothing but of her assembly and *ruelle*; who writes tender things in prose and in verse, and is visited by Marquises and wits, whilst, as "Mrs. So-and-so's husband," I should be like a saint, whom no one calls upon! No, no, I will have none of your lofty minds. A woman who writes knows more than she ought to do. I intend that my wife shall not even be clever enough to know what a rhyme is. If one plays at *corbillion* with her, and asks her in her turn "What is put into the basket," I will have her answer, "A cream tart." In a word, let her be very ignorant; and to tell you the plain truth, it is enough for her that she can say her prayers, love me, sew and spin.

Chrysalde: - A stupid wife, then, is your fancy?

Arnolphe: - So much so that I should prefer a very stupid and ugly woman to a very beautiful one with a great deal of wit.

Chrysalde: - Wit and beauty—

Arnolphe: - Virtue is quite enough.

Chrysalde: -But how can you expect, after, all, that a mere simpleton can ever know what it is to be virtuous? Besides, to my mind, it must be very wearisome for a man to have a stupid creature perpetually with him. Do you think you act rightly, and that, by reliance on your plan, a man's brow is saved from danger? A woman of sense may fail in her duty; but she must at least do so knowingly; a stupid woman may at any time fail in hers, without desiring or thinking of it.

Arnolphe: -To this fine argument, this deep discourse, I reply as Pantagruel did to Panurge: Urge me to marry any other woman than a stupid one; preach and lecture till Whitsuntide, you shall be amazed to find, when you have done, that you have not persuaded me in the very slightest.

Chrysalde: -I do not want to say another word.

Arnolphe: -Every man has his own way. With my wife, as in everything, I mean to follow my fashion. I think I am rich enough to take a partner who shall owe all to me, and whose humble station and complete dependence cannot reproach me either with her poverty or her birth. A sweet and staid look made me love Agnès, amongst other children, when she was only four. It came into my mind to ask from her mother, who was very poor; the good country-woman, learning my wish, was delighted to rid herself of the charge. I had her brought up, according to my own notions, in a little solitary convent; that is to say, directing them what means to adopt in order to make her as idiotic as possible. Thank Heaven, success has crowned my efforts; and I am very thankful to say, I have found her so innocent that I have blessed Heaven for having done what I wished, in giving me a wife according to my desire. Then I brought her away; and as my house is continually open to a hundred different people, and as we must be on our guard against everything, I have kept her in another house where no one comes to see me; and where her good disposition cannot be spoiled, as she meets none but people as simple as herself. You will say, "Wherefore this long story?" It is to let you see the care I have taken. To crown all, and as you are a trusty friend, I ask you to sup with her to-night. I wish you would examine her a little, and see if I am to be condemned for my choice.

Chrysalde: -With all my heart.

Arnolphe: -You can judge of her looks and her innocence when you converse with her.

Chrysalde: -As to that, what you have told me cannot—

Arnolphe: -What I have told you falls even short of the truth:

I admire her simplicity on all occasions; sometimes she says things at which I split my sides with laughter. The other day— would you believe it?—she was uneasy, and came to ask me, with unexampled innocence, if children came through the ears.

Chrysalde: -I greatly rejoice, M. Arnolphe—

Arnolphe: -What! Will you always call me by that name?

Chrysalde: -Ah, it comes to my lips in spite of me; I never remember M. de la Souche. Who on earth has put it into your head to change your name at forty-two years of age, and give yourself a title from a rotten old tree on your farm?

Arnolphe: -Besides the fact that the house is known by that name, la Souche pleases my ears better than Arnolphe.

Chrysalde: -What a pity to give up the genuine name of one's fathers, and take one based on chimeras! Most people have an itching that way, and, without including you in the comparison, I knew a country-fellow called Gros-Pierre, who, having no other property but a rood of land, had a muddy ditch made all around it, and took the high-sounding name of M. de l'Isle.

Arnolphe: -You might dispense with such examples. But, at all events, de la Souche is the name I bear. I have a reason for it, I like it; and to call me otherwise is to annoy me.

Chrysalde: -Most people find it hard to fall in with it; I even yet see letters addressed—

Arnolphe: -I endure it easily from those who are not informed; but you—

Chrysalde: -Be it so; we will make no difficulty about that; I will take care to accustom my lips to call you nothing else than M.de la Souche.

Arnolphe: - Farewell. I am going to knock here, to wish them good morning, and simply to say that I have come back...

Chrysalde: - (*aside*). Upon my word, I think he is a perfect fool.

Arnolphe: - (*alone*). He is a little touched on certain points. Strange, to see how each man is passionately fond of his own opinion. (*Knocks at his door*) Hulloo!

**Scene II- Arnolphe, Alain, Georgette, *within*.**

Alain: - Who knocks?

Arnolphe: - Open the door! (*Aside.*) I think they will be very glad to see me after ten days' absence.

Alain: - Who is there?

Arnolphe: - I.

Alain: - Georgette!

Georgette: - Well!

Alain: - Open the door there!

Georgette: - Go, and do it yourself!

Alain: - You go and do it!

Georgette: - Indeed, I shall not go.

Alain: - No more shall I.

Arnolphe: - Fine compliments, while I am left without. Hulloo! Here, please.

Georgette: - Who knocks?

Arnolphe: - Your master.

Georgette: - Alain!

Alain: - What!

Georgette: - It is the master open the door quickly.

Alain: - Open it yourself.

Georgette: - I am blowing the fire.

Alain: - I am taking care that sparrow that does not go out, for fear of the cat.

Arnolphe: - Whoever of you two does not open the door shall have no food for four days. Ah!

Georgette: - Why do you come when I was running?

Alain: - Why should you more than I? A pretty trick indeed!

Georgette: - Stand out of the way.

Alain: - Stand out of the way yourself.

Georgette: - I wish to open the door.

Alain: - And so do I.

Georgette: - You shall not.

Alain: - No more shall you.

Georgette: - Nor you.

Arnolphe: - I need have patience here.

Alain: - (*entering*). There; it is I, master.

Georgette: - (*entering*). Your servant; it is I.

Alain: - If it were not out of respect for master here, I—

Arnolphe: - (*receiving a push from Alain*). Hang it!

Alain: - Pardon me.

Arnolphe: - Look at the lout!

Alain: - It was she also, master—

Arnolphe: - Hold your tongues, both of you. Just answer me and let us have no more fooling. Well, Alain how is everyone here?

Alain: - Master, we—(*Arnolphe takes off Alain's hat*). Master, we—(*Arnolphe takes it off again*). Thank Heaven, we—

Arnolphe: - (*taking off the hat a third time and flinging it on the ground*). Who taught you, impertinent fool, to speak to me with your hat on your head?

Alain: - You are right; I am wrong.

Arnolphe: - (*to Alain*). Ask Agnès to come down.

Arnolphe: - Was she sad after I went away?

Georgette: - Sad? No.

Arnolphe: - No?

Georgette: - Yes, yes.

Arnolphe: - Why then?

Georgette: - May I die on the spot, but she expected to see you return every minute; and we never heard a horse, an ass, or a mule pas by without her thinking it was you.

### **Scene III Agnès, Alain, Georgette, Arnolphe.**

Arnolphe: - Work in hand? That is a good sign. Well, Agnès, I have returned. Are u glad of it?

Agnès: - Yes, sir, Heaven be thanked.

Arnolphe: - I too am glad to see you again. You have always been well? I see you have.

Agnès: - Except for the fleas, which trouble me in the night.

Arnolphe: - Ah, you shall soon have some one to drive them away.

Agnès: - I shall be pleased with that.

Arnolphe: - I can easily imagine it. What are you doing there?

Agnès: - I am making myself some caps. Your nightshirts and caps are finished

Arnolphe: - Ah, that is all right. Well, go upstairs. Do not tire yourself. I will soon return, and talk to you of important matters.

Arnolphe(*alone*): - Heorines of the day, learned ladies, who spout tender and fine sentiments, I defy in a breath all your verses, your novels, your letters, your love-letters, your entire science, to be worth as much as this virtuous and modest ignorance. We must not be dazzled by riches; and so long as honour is—

### **Scene – IV – Horace, Arnolphe.**

Arnolphe: - What do I see? Is it— Yes. I am mistaken. But no. No; it is himself. Hor—

Horace: - Mr. Arn—

Arnolphe: - Horace.

Horace: - Arnolphe.

Arnolphe: - Ah! What joy indeed! And how long have you been here?

Horace: - Nine days.

Arnolphe: - Really.

Horace: - I went straight to your house, but in vain.

Arnolphe: - I was in the country.

Horace: - Yes, you had been gone 10 days.

Arnolphe: - Oh, how these children spring up in few years! I am amazed to see him so tall, after having known him no higher than that.

Horace: - You see how it is.

Arnolphe: - But tell me how is Oronte, your father, my good and dear friend, whom I esteem and revere? What is he doing? What is he saying? Is he still hearty? He knows I am interested in all that affects him; we have not seen one another these four years, nor, what is more, written to each other, I think.

Horace: - M. Arnolphe, Hes even more cheerful than we; I had a letter from him for you. But he has since informed me in another letter, that he is coming here, though as yet I do not know the reason for it. Can you tell me which of your townsmen has returned with abundance of wealth earned during a fourteen years' residence in America?

Arnolphe: - No. Have you not heard his name?

Horace: - Enrique.

Arnolphe: - No.

Horace: - My father speaks of him and his return, as though he should be well known to me; he writes that they are about to set out together, on an affair of consequence, of which his letter says nothing. (*Gives Oronte's letter to Arnolphe*)

Arnolphe: - I shall assuredly be very glad to see him, and shall do my best to entertain him. (*After reading the letter.*) Friends do not need to send such polite letters, and all these compliments are unnecessary. Even if he had not taken the trouble to write one word, you might have freely disposed of all I have.

Horace: - I am a man who takes people at their word; and I have present need of a hundred pistoles.

Arnolphe: - Upon my word, you oblige me by using me thus. I rejoice that I have them with me. Keep the purse too.

Horace: - I must –

Arnolphe: -Drop this ceremony. Well, how do you like this town so far?

Horace: - Its inhabitants are numerous, its buldings splendid, and I should think that its amusements are wonderful.

Arnolphe: - Everyone had his own pleasures, after his own fashion; but for those whom we christen our gallants, they have in this town just what pleases them, for the women are born flirts. Dark and fair are amiably disposed, and the husbands also are the most kind in the world. It is a pleasure fit for a king; to me it is a mere comedy to see the pranks I do. Perhaps you have already smitten someone. Have you had no

adventure yet? Men of your figure can do more than men who have money, and you are cut out to make her cuckold.

Horace: - Not to deceive you as to the simple truth, I have had a certain love-passage in these parts, and friendship compels me to tell you of it.

Arnolphe: - (*aside*). Good. Here is another queer story to set down in my pocket-book.

Horace: - But pray, let these things be secret.

Arnolphe: - Oh!

Horace: - You know that in these matters a secret divulged destroys our expectations. I will then frankly confess to you that my heart has been smitten in this place by a certain fair maid. My little attentions were at once so successful that I obtained a pleasant introduction to her; not to boast too much, nor to do her an injustice, affairs go very well with me.

Arnolphe: - (*laughing*). Ha! Ha! And she is—

Horace: - (*pointing to the house of Agnès*). A young creature living in yonder house, of which you can see the red walls from this. Simple, of a truth, through the matchless folly of a man who hides her from all the world; but who, amidst the ignorance in which he would enslave her, discloses charms that throw one into raptures, as well as a thoroughly engaging manner and something indescribably tender, against which no heart is proof. But perhaps you have seen this young star of love, adorned by so many charms. Agnès is her name.

Arnolphe: - (*aside*). Oh! I shall burst with rage!

Horace: - As for the man, I think his name is De la Zousse, or Souche; I did not concern myself about the name. He is rich, by what they told me, but not one of the wisest of men; they say he is a ridiculous fellow. Do you not know him?

Arnolphe: - (*aside*). It is a bitter pill I have to swallow!

Horace: - Why, you do not speak a word.

Arnolphe: - Oh, yes—I know him.

Horace: - He is a fool, is he not?

Arnolphe: - Ugh!

Horace: - What do you say? Ugh— that means yes? Jealous, I suppose, ridiculously so? Stupid? I see he is just as they told me. To be brief, the lovely Agnès has succeeded in enslaving me. She is a pretty jewel, to tell you honestly; it would be a sin if such a rare beauty were left in the power of this eccentric fellow. For me, all my efforts, all my dearest wishes, are to make her mine in spite of this jealous wretch; and the money which I so freely borrow of you, was only to bring this laudable enterprise to a conclusion. You know better than I, that, whatever we undertake, money is the masterkey to all great plans, and that this sweet metal, which distracts so many, promotes our triumphs, in love as in war. You seem vexed? Can it be that you disapprove of my design?



Arnolphe: - No; but I was thinking—

Horace: - This conversation wearies you? Farewell. I will soon pay you a visit to return thanks.

Arnolphe: - (*thinking to himself alone*). What! must it—

Horace: - (*returning*). Once again, pray be discrete; do not go and spread my secret abroad.

Arnolphe: - (*thinking himself alone*). I feel within my soul—

Horace: - (*returning again*). And above all to my father, who would perhaps get enraged, if he knew of it.

Arnolphe: - (*expecting Horace to return again*). Oh!-Oh, what I have endured during this conversation! Never was trouble of mind equal to mine! With what rashness and extreme haste did he come to tell me of this affair! Though my second name keeps him at fault, did ever any blunderer run on so furiously? But, having endured so much, I ought to have refrained until I had learned that which I have reason to fear, to have drawn out his foolish chattering to the end and ascertained their secret understanding completely. Let me try to overtake him; I fancy he is not far off. Let me worm from him the whole mystery. I tremble for the misfortune which may befall me; for we often seek more than we wish to find.

## ACT II

### Scene I Arnolphe.-

Arnolphe: -(*alone*) It is no doubt well,when I think of it, that I have lost my way, and failed to find him; for after all, I should not have been able entirely to conceal from his eyes the overwhelming pang of my heart. The grief that preys upon would have broken forth, and I do not wish him to know what he is at present ignorant of. But I am not the man to put up with this, and leave a free field for this young spark to pursue his design. I am resolved to check his progress, and learn, without delay, how far they understand each other. My honour is specially involved in this. I regard her already as my wife. She cannot have made a slip without covering me with shame; and whatever she does will be placed to my account. Fatal absence! Unfortunate voyage! (*Knocks at his door.*)

### Scene II: - Arnolphe, Alain, Georgette.

Alain: -Ah, master, this time—

Arnolphe: - Peace. Come here, both of you. That way, that way. Come along, come, I tell you.

Georgette: - Ah, you frighten me; all my blood runs cold.

Arnolphe: - Is it thus you have obeyed me in my absence? You have both combined to betray me!

Georgette: - (*falling at Arnolphe's feet*). Oh, master, do not eat me, I implore you.

Alain: - (*aside*). I am sure some mad dog has bitten him.

Arnolphe: - (*aside*). Ugh, I cannot speak, I am so filled with rage. I am chocking, and should like to throw off my clothes—(*to Alain and Georgette*). You cursed scoundrels, you have permitted a man to come—(*to Alain, who tries to escape*). You would run away, would you! You must this instant—(*to Georgette*). If you move—Now I wish you to tell me—(*to Alain*). Hi!—Yes, I wish you both—(*Alain and Georgette rise, and again try to escape*)—Whoever of you moves, upon my word, I shall knock him down. How came that man into my house? Now speak. Make haste, quick, directly, instantly, no thinking! Will you speak?

*Both*: -. Oh, oh!

Georgette: - (*falling at his knees*). My heart fails me!

Alain: - (*falling at his knees*). I am dying.

Arnolphe: - (*aside*). I perspire all over. Let me take a breath. I must fan myself, and walk about. Could I believe, when I saw Horace as a littleboy, that he would grow up for this? Heaven, how I suffer! I think it would be better that I should gently draw from Agnès own mouth an account of what touches me so. Let me try to moderate my anger. Patience, my heart; softly, softly. (*To Alain and Georgette*.) Rise, go in and bid Agnès come to me—Stay, her surprise would be less. They will go and tell her how uneasy I am. I will go myself and bring her out. (*To Alain and Georgette*.) Wait for me here.

### Scene III: - Alain, Georgette.

Georgette: -Heavens, how terrible he is! His looks made me afraid—horribly afraid. Never did I see a more hideous Christian.

Alain: -This gentleman has vexed him; I told you so.

Georgette: -But what on earth is the reason that he so strictly makes us keep our mistress in the house? Why does he wish to hide her from all world, and cannot bear to see any one approach her?

Alain: - Because that makes him jealous.

Georgette: -But how has he got such a fancy in his head?

Alain: - Because—because he is jealous.

Georgette: - Yes; but wherefore is he so? And why this anger?

Alain: - Because-jealousy—understand me, Georgette, jealousy is a thing—a thing—which makes people uneasy—and which drives folk all round the house. I am going to give you an example, so that you may understand the thing better. Tell me, is it not true, that when you have your broth in your hand, and some hungry person comes up to eat it, you would be in a rage, and be ready to beat him?

Georgette: -Yes, I understand that.

Alain: -It is just the same. Woman is in fact the broth of man; and when a man sees other folks sometimes, trying to dip their fingers in his broth, he soon displays extreme anger at it.

Georgette: - Yes; but why does not everyone do the same? Why do we see some who appear to be pleased when their wives are with handsome fine gentlemen?

Alain: -Because every one has not the greedy love which will give nothing away.

Georgette: -If am not blind, I see him returning.

Alain: -Your eyes are good; it is he.

Georgette: -See how vexed he is.

Alain: -That is because he is in trouble.

#### **Scene IV: - - Arnolphe, Agnès, Alain, Georgette.**

Arnolphe: - (*aside*). A certain Greek told the Emperor Augustus, as an axiom as useful as it was true, that when any accident puts us in a rage, we should, first of all repeat the alphabet; so that in the interval our anger may abate, and we may do nothing that we ought not to do. I have followed his advice in the matter of Agnès; and I have brought her here designedly, under pretence of taking a walk, so that the suspicions of my disordered mind may cunningly lead her to the topic, and, by sounding her heart, gently find out the truth.

Arnolphe: - Come, Agnès. (*To Alain and Georgette*) Get in you.

#### **Scene V: -Arnolphe, Agnès.**

Arnolphe: -This is a nice walk.

Agnès: - Very nice.

Arnolphe: - What a fine day.

Agnès: -Very fine.

Arnolphe: -What news?

Agnès: - The kitten is dead.

Arnolphe: - Pity! But what then? We are all mortal, and everyone is for himself. Did it rain when I was in the country?

Agnès: - No.

Arnolphe: - Were you not wearied?

Agnès: -I am never wearied.

Arnolphe: -What did you do then, these nine or ten days?

Agnès: - Six shirts, I think, and six nightcaps also.

Arnolphe: - (*after musing*). The world, dear Agnès, is a strange place. Observe the scandal, and how everybody gossips. Some of the neighbours have told me that an unknown young man came to the house in my absence; that you permitted him to see and talk to you. But I did not believe these slandering tongues, and I offered to bet that it was false—

Agnès: -Oh, Heaven, do not bet; you would assuredly lose.

Arnolphe: - What! It is true that a man-

Agnès: -Quite true. I declare to you that he was scarcely ever out of the house.

Arnolphe: - (*aside*) this confession, so candidly made, atleast assures me of me her simplicity, (*aloud*.) But I think, Agnès if my memory is clear, that I forbade you to see any one.

Agnès: - Yes; but you do not know why I saw him; you would doubtless have done as much.

Arnolphe: -Possibly; but tell me then how it was.

Agnès: -It is very wonderful, and hard to believe. I was on the balcony, working in the open air, when I saw a handsome young man passing close to me under the trees, who, seeing me look at me him, immediately bowed respectfully. I, not to be rude, made him curtsy. Suddenly he made another bow; I quickly made another curtsy; and when he repeated it for the third time, I answered it directly with a third curtsy. He went on, returned, went past again, and each time made me another bow. And I who was looking earnestly at all these acts of politeness, returned him as many curtsies; so that if night had not fallen just then, I should have kept on continually in that way; not wishing to yield, and have the vexation of his thinking of me less civil than himself.

Arnolphe: -Very good.

Agnès: - Next day, being at the door, an old woman accosted me, and said to me something like this: "My child, may good Heaven bless you, and keep you long in all your beauty. It did not make you such a lovely creature to abuse its gift; you must know that you have wounded a heart which to-day is driven to complain".

Arnolphe (*aside*).Oh, tool of Satan! Damnable wretch!

Agnès: -"Have I wounded any one?"I answered quite astonished. "Yes," she said, "wounded; you have indeed wounded a gentleman. It is him you saw yesterday from the balcony." "Alas!" said I, "what could have been the cause? Did I, without thinking, let anything fall on him?" "No", replied she; "it was your eyes which gave the fatal blow; from their glances came all his injury." "Alas! Good Heaven" said I, "I am more than ever surprised. Do my eyes contain something bad, that they can give it to other people?" "Yes," cried she, "your eyes, my girl, have a poison to hurt withal, of which you know nothing. In a word, the poor fellow pines away; and if" continued the charitable old woman, "your cruelty refuses him assistance, it is likely he shall be carried to his grave in a couple of days." "Bless me!" said I, "I would be very sorry for that; but what assistance does he require of me?" "My child" said she, "he requests only the happiness of seeing conversing with you. Your eyes alone can prevent his ruin, cure the disease they have caused." "Oh! Gladly," said I; "and, since it is so, he may come to see me here as often as he likes."

Arnolphe: - (*aside*). O cursed witch! Poisoner of souls! May hell reward your charitable tricks!

Agnès: - That is how he came to see me, and got cured. Now tell me, frankly, if I was not right? And could I, after all, have the conscience to let him die for lack of aid?— I, who feel so much pity for suffering people, and cannot see a chicken die without weeping!

Arnolphe: - (*aside*). All this comes only from an innocent soul; I blame my imprudent absence for it, which left this kindness of heart without a protector, exposed to the wiles of artful seducers. I fear that the rascal, in his bold passion, has carried the matter somewhat beyond a joke.

Agnès: - What ails you? I think you are a little angry. Was there anything wrong in what I have told you?

Arnolphe: - No. But tell me what followed, and how the young man behaved during his visits.

Agnès: - Alas! If you but knew how delightful he was; how he got rid of his illness as soon as I saw him, the present he made me of a lovely casket, and the money which Alain and Georgette have had from him, you would no doubt love him, and say as we say—

Arnolphe: - Yes. But what did he do when he was alone with you?

Agnès: - He swore that he loved me with an unequalled passion, and said the prettiest words possible, things that nothing ever can equal, the sweetness of which charms me whenever I hear him speak, and moves I know not what within me.

Arnolphe: - (*aside*). Oh! Sad inquiry into a fatal mystery, in which the inquirer alone suffers all the pain, (*aloud*) Besides all these speeches, all these pretty compliments, did he not also bestow a few caresses on you?

Agnès: - Oh, so many! He took my hands and my arms, and was never tired of kissing them.

Arnolphe: - Agnès, did he take nothing else from you? (*seeing her confused.*) Ugh!

Agnès: - Why, he-

Arnolphe: - What?

Agnès. Took-

Arnolphe: - Ugh!

Agnès. The-

Arnolphe: - Well?

Agnès: - I dare not tell you; you will perhaps be angry with me.

Arnolphe: - No.

Agnès: -Yes, but you will.

Arnolphe: -Good Heavens! No.

Agnès: -Swear on your word .

Arnolphe: - On my word, then .

Agnès: - He took my – you will be in a passion.

Arnolphe: - No.

Agnès: - Yes.

Arnolphe: - No, no, no, no! What the devil is this mystery? What did he take from you?

Agnès: - He-

Arnolphe: - (*aside*). I am suffering the torments of the damned.

Agnès: - He-

Arnolphe: - (*aside*). He took away from me the ribbon you gave me.To tell you the truth, I could not prevent him.

Arnolphe: - (*drawing his breath*). Oh! let the ribbon go.But I want to know if he did nothing to you but kiss your arms.

Agnès. Why! Do people do other things?

Arnolphe: - Not at all. But, to cure disorder which he said had seized him, did he not ask you for any other remedy?

Agnès: - No. You may judge that I would have granted him anything to do him good,if he had asked for it.

Arnolphe: - (*aside*) .By the kindness of Heaven, I am cheaply out of it! May I be blessed if I fall into such a mistake again! (*Aloud*).Pooh! That is the result of your innocence, Agnès. I shall say no more about it.What is done is done.I know that, by flattering you, the gallant only wishes to deceive you, and to laugh at you afterwards.

Agnès: - Oh, no! He told me so more than a score of times.

Arnolphe: - Ah! You do not know that he is not to be believed. But, now, learn to accept caskets, and to listen to the nonsense of these handsome fops, to allow them languidly to kiss your hands and charm your heart, is a mortal sin, and one these greatest that can be committed.

Agnès: -A sin, do you say? And why, pray?

Arnolphe: - Why? The reason is the the absolute law that Heaven is incensed by such things.

---

Agnès: - Incensed! But why should it be incensed? Ah, it is so sweet and agreeable! How strange is the joy one feels from all this; uoto this time I was ignorant of these things.

Arnolphe: - Yes, all these tender passages, these pretty speeches and sweet caresses, are a great pleasure; but they must be enjoyed in an honest manner, and their sin should be taken away by marriage.

Agnès: -Is it no longer a sin when one is married?

Arnnolphe: - No.

Agnès: -Then please marry me quickly.

Arnolphe: -If you wish it also; I have returned hither for the purpose of marrying you.

Agnès: - Is that possible?

Arnolphe: - Yes.

Agnès: -How happy you will make me!

Arnolphe: - Yes, I have no doubt that marriage will please you.

Agnès: - Then we two shall—

Arnolphe: - Nothing is more certain.

Agnès: - How I shall caress you, if this comes to pass.

Arnolphe: - Ha! And I shall do the same to you.

Agnès: - I can never tell when people are jesting. Do you speak seriously?

Arnolphe: - Yes, you might see that I do.

Agnès: - We are to be married?

Arnolphe: -Yes.

Agnès: - But when?

Arnolphe: - This very evening.

Agnès: - (*laughing*) This very evening?

Arnolphe: - This very evening. Does that make you laugh?

Agnès: -Yes.

Arnolphe: -To see you happy is my desire.

---

Agnès: - Oh, how greatly I am obliged to you, and what satisfaction I shall have with him!

Arnolphe: -With whom?

Agnès: -With—him there—

Arnolphe: - Him there! I am not speaking of him there. You are a little quick in selecting a husband. In a word, it is some one else whom I have ready for you. And as for that gentleman, I require, by your leave (though the illness of which he accuses you should be death of him), that henceforth you break off all intercourse with him; that, when he comes to the house, you will, by way of compliment, just shut the door in his face; throw a stone out of the window at him when he knocks, and oblige him good earnest never to appear again. Do you hear me, Agnès? I shall observe your behaviour, concealed in a recess.

Agnès: - Oh dear, he is so handsome! He is—

Arnolphe: - Ha! How are you talking!

Agnès: - I shall not have the heart—

Arnolphe: - No more chatter. Go upstairs.

Agnès: - But surely! Will you—

Arnolphe: - Enough. I am master; I command; do you go and obey.

### ACT III

#### Scene I: -Arnolphe, Agnès, Alain, Georgette.

Arnolphe: - Yes, all has gone well; my joy is extreme. You have obeyed my orders to perfection, and brought the fair seducer to utter confusion. See what it is to have a wise counsellor. Your innocence, Agnès, had been betrayed; look what you had been brought to, before you had been aware of it. You were treading, deprived of my warning, right-down the broad path to hell and perdition. The way of all these young fops is but too well known. They have their fine rolls, plenty of ribbons and plumes, big wigs, good teeth, a smooth address; but I tell you they have the cloven foot beneath; and they are very devils, whose corrupt appetites try to prey upon the honor of women. This time, however, thanks to the care that has been taken, you have escaped with your virtue. This style in which I saw you throw that stone at him, which has dashed the hopes of all his plans, still more determines me not to delay the marriage for which I told you to prepare. But, before all, it is well I should speak a few words with you which may be salutary. (To Georgette *and* Alain). Bring out a chair in the open air. As for you, if you ever—

Georgette: - Well shall we take care to remember all your instructions, that other gentleman imposed on us, but—

Alain: - If he ever gets in here, may I never drink another drop. Besides he is a fool. He gave us two gold crowns the other day, which were under weight.

Arnolphe: - Well, get what I ordered for supper; and as to the contract I spoke of, let one of you fetch the notary who lives at the corner of the market-place.



## Scene II: -Arnolphe, Agnès.

Arnolphe: - (*seated*). Agnès, put your work down, and listen to me. Raise your head a little, and turn your face round. (*Putting his finger on his forehead.*) There, look at me here while I speak, and take good note of even the smallest word. I am going to wed you, Agnès; you ought to bless your stars a hundred times a day, to think of your former low estate, and at the same time, to wonder at my goodness in raising you from a poor country girl to the honourable rank of a citizen's wife; to enjoy the bed and the embraces of a man who has shunned all such trammels, and whose heart has refused to a score of women, well fitted to please, the honour which he intends to confer on you. You must always keep in mind, I say, how insignificant you would be without this glorious alliance, in order that the picture may teach you the better to merit the condition in which I shall place you, and make you always know yourself, so that I may never repent of what I am doing. Marriage, Agnès, is no joke. The position of a wife calls for strict duties; I do not mean to exalt you to that condition, in order that you may be free and take your ease. Your sex is formed for dependence. Omnipotence goes with the beard. Though there are two halves in the connection, yet these two halves are by no means equal. The one half is supreme, and the other subordinate: the one is all submission to the other which rules; the obedience which the well disciplined soldier shows to his leader, the servant to his master, a child to his parent, the lowest monk to his superior, is far below the docility, obedience, humility, and profound respect due from the wife to her husband, her chief, her lord and her master. When he looks at her gravely, her duty is at once to lower her eyes, never daring to look at him in the face, until he chooses to favour her with a tender glance. Our women now-a-days do not understand this; but do not be spoiled by the example of others. Take care not to imitate those miserable flirts whose pranks are talked of all over the city; and do not let the evil one tempt you, that is, do not listen to any young coxcombs. Remember, Agnès, that, in making you part of myself, I give my honour into your hands, which honour is fragile, and easily damaged; that it will not do to trifle in such a matter, and that there are boiling cauldrons in hell, into which wives who live wickedly are thrown for evermore. I am not telling you a parcel of stories; you ought to let these lessons sink into your heart. If you practice them sincerely, and take care not to flirt, your soul will ever be white and spotless as a lily; but if you stain your honour, it will become as black as coal. You will seem hideous to all, and one day you will become the devil's own property, and boil in hell to all eternity—from which may the goodness of Heaven defend you! Make a curtsy. As a novice in a convent ought to know her duties by heart, so it ought to be on getting married: here in my pocket I have an important document which will teach you the duty of a wife. I do not know the author, but it is some good soul or other; and I desire that this shall be your only study. (*Rises.*) Stay. Let me see if you can read it fairly.

Agnès: - (*reads*) *The Maxims of Marriage; or the Duties of a Wife; together with her Daily Exercise.*

*“First Maxim.*

“She who is honourably wed should remember, notwithstanding the fashion now-a-days, that the man who marries does not take a wife for anyone but for himself.”

Arnolphe. I shall explain what that means, but at present let us only read.

Agnès (*continues*)—

*“Second Maxim.*

“She ought not to bedeck herself more than her husband likes. The care of her beauty concerns him alone; and if others think her plain, that must go for nothing.”

---

*“Third Maxim.*

“Far from her be the study of ogling, washes, paints, pomatums, and the thousand preparations for a good complexion. There are fatal persons to honour; and the pains bestowed to look beautiful are seldom taken for a husband.

*“Fourth Maxim.*

“When she goes out, she conceals the glances of her eyes beneath her hood, as honour requires; for in order to please her husband rightly, she should please none else.

*“Fifth Maxim.*

“It is fit that she receives none but those who visit her husband. The gallants that have no business but with the wife, are not agreeable to the husband.

*“Sixth Maxim.*

“She must firmly refuse presents from men, for in these days nothing is given for nothing.

*“Seventh Maxim”*

“Amongst her furniture, however she dislikes it, there must be neither writing-desk, ink, paper, nor pens. According to all good rules everything written in the house should be written by the husband.

*“Eighth Maxim.*

“Those disorderly meetings, called social gatherings, ever corrupt the minds of women. It is good policy to forbid them; for they conspire against the poor husbands.

*“Ninth Maxim.*

“Every woman who wishes to preserve her honour should abstain from gambling as a plague; for play is very seductive, and often drives a woman to put down her last stake.

*“Tenth Maxim.*

“She must not venture on public promenades nor picnics; for wise men are of opinion that it is always the husband who pays for such treats.

*“Eleventh Maxim—”*

Arnolphe: - You shall finish it by yourself; and, by and by, I shall explain these things to you properly, word for word. I bethink myself of an engagement, I have but one word to say, and I shall not stay long. Go in again, and take special care of this volume. If the notary comes, let him wait for me a short time.

**Scene III: -Arnolphe, alone.**

I cannot do better than make her my wife. I shall be able to mould her as I please; she is like a bit of wax in my hands, and I can give her what shape I like. She was near

being wiled away from me in my absence through her excess of simplicity; but, to say the truth, it is better that a wife should err on that side. The cure for these faults is easy; every simple person is docile; and if she is led out of the right way, a couple of words will instantly bring her back again. But a clever woman is quite another sort of animal. Our lot depends only on her judgement; nought can divert her from what she set on, and our teaching in such a case is futile. Her wit avails her to ridicule our maxims, often to turn her vices into virtues, and to find means to cheat the ablest, so as to compass her own ends. We labour in vain to parry the blow; a clever woman is a devil at intrigue, and when her whim has mutely passed sentence on our honour, we must knock under. Many good fellows could tell as much. But my blundering friend shall have no cause to laugh; he has reaped the harvest of his gossips. This is the general fault of Frenchmen. When they have a love adventure, secrecy bores them, and silly vanity has so many charms for them, that they would rather hang themselves than hold their tongues. Ah! women are an easy prey to Satan when they go and choose such addle-pates! And when— But here he is—I must dissemble, and find out how he has been mortified.

**Scene IV: -Horace, Arnolphe.**

Horace: - I've just come from your house. Fate seems resolved that I shall never meet you there. But I shall go so often that some time or other—

Arnolphe: - Bah, for goodness' sake, do not let us begin these idle compliments. Nothing vexes me like ceremony; and, if I could have my way, it should be abolished. It is a wretched custom, and most people foolishly waste two-thirds of their time on it. Let us put on our hats, without more ado. (*Puts on his hat.*) Well, how about your love affair? May I know, Mr. Horace, how it goes? I was diverted for a while by some business that came into my head; but since then I have been thinking of it. I admire the rapidity of your commencement, and am interested in the issue.

Horace: -Indeed, since I confided in you, my love has been unfortunate.

Arnolphe: -Ay! How so?

Horace: -Cruel fate has brought her governor back from the country.

Arnolphe: -What bad luck!

Horace: - Moreover, to my great sorrow, he has discovered what has passed in private between us.

Arnolphe: - How the deuce could he discover this affair so soon?

Horace: -I do not know; but it certainly is so. I meant, at the usual hour, to pay a short visit to my young charmer, when, with altered voice and looks, her two servants barred my entrance, and somewhat rudely shut the door in my face, saying "Begone, you bring us into trouble!"

Arnolphe: -The door in your face!

Horace: - In my face.

Arnolphe: -That was rather hard.

---

Horace: - I wished to speak to them through the door; but to all I said their only answer was, "You shan't come in; master has forbidden it."

Arnolphe: - Did they not open the door then?

Horace: - No. And Agnès from the window made me more certain as to her master's return, by bidding me begone in a very angry tone, and flinging a stone at me.

Arnolphe: -What, a stone?

Horace: - Not a small one either; that was how she rewarded my visit with her own hands.

Arnolphe: - The devil! These are no trifles. Your affair seems to me in a bad way.

Horace: -True, I am in a quandary through this unlucky return.

Arnolphe: - Really I am sorry for you; I declare I am.

Horace: - This fellow mars all.

Arnolphe: -Yes, but that is nothing. You will find a way to recover yourself.

Horace: -I must try by some device to baffle the strict watch of this jealous fellow.

Arnolphe: -That will be easy: after all the girl loves you.

Horace: - Doubtless.

Arnolphe: -You will compass your end.

Horace: -I hope so.

Arnolphe: -The stone has put you out, but you cannot wonder at it.

Horace: - True; and I understand in a moment that my arrival was there, and that he was directing all without being seen. But what surprised me, and will surprise you, is another incident I am going to tell you of; a bold stroke this lovely girl, which one could not have expected from her simplicity. Love, it must be allowed, is an able master; he teaches us to be what we never were before; a complete change in our manners is often the work of a moment under his tuition. He breaks through the impediments in our nature, and his sudden feats have the air of miracles. In an instant he makes the miser liberal, a coward brave, a churl polite. He renders the dullest soul fit for anything, and gives wit to the most simple. Yes, this last miracle is surprising in Agnès; for blurting out these very words: "Begone, I am resolved never to receive your visits. I know all you would say, and *there* is my answer!"—this stone, or pebble, at which you are surprised, fell at my feet, with a letter. I greatly admire this note, chiming in with the significance of her words, and the casting of the stone. Are you not surprised by such an action as this? Does not love know how to sharpen the understanding? And can it be denied that his ardent flames have marvellous effects on the heart? What say you of the trick, and of the letter? Ah, do you not admire her cunning contrivance? Is it not amusing to see what a part my jealous rival has played in all this game? Say—

Arnolphe: - Ay, very amusing.

---

Horace: -Laugh at it, then. (Arnolphe *forces a laugh*.) This fellow, garrisoned against my passion, who shuts himself up in his house, and seems provided with stones, as though I were preparing to enter by storm, who, in his ridiculous terror, encourages all his household to drive me away, is tricked before his very eyes by her whom he would keep in the utmost ignorance! For my part, I confess that, although his return throws my love affair in disorder, I think all this so exceedingly comical, that I cannot forbear laughing at it whenever it comes into my head. It seems to me that you do not laugh at it half enough.

Arnolphe: - (*with a forced laugh*). I beg your pardon; I laugh at it as much as I can.

Horace: -But I must show you her letter, for friendship's sake. Her hand knew how to set down all that her heart felt; but in such touching terms, so kind, so innocently tender, so ingenuous—in a word, just as an unaffected nature confesses its first attack of love.

Arnolphe: - (*softly*). This is the use you make of writing, you hussy. It was against my wish you ever learned it.

Horace: - (*reads*). "*I wish to write to you, but I am at a loss how to begin. I have some thoughts which I should like you to know; but I do not know how to tell them to you, and I mistrust my own words. As I begin to feel that I have been always kept in ignorance, I fear to say something which is not right, and to express more than I ought. In fact I do not know what you have done to me; but I feel that I am desperately vexed at what I am made to do against you, that it will be the hardest thing in the world for me to do without you, and that I should be very glad to be with you. Perhaps it is wrong to say that, but the truth is I cannot help saying it, and I wish it could be brought about without harm. I am assured that all young men are deceivers, that they must not be listened to, and that all you told me was but to deceive me; but I assure you I have not yet come to believe that of you, and I am so touched by your words that I could not believe them false. Tell me frankly, if they be: for, to be brief, as I am without an evil thought, you would be extremely wicked to deceive me, and I think I should die of vexation at such a thing.*"

Arnolphe: - (*aside*). Ah, the cat!

Horace: - What is wrong?

Arnolphe: -Wrong? Nothing! I was only coughing.

Horace: - Have you ever heard a more tender expression? In spite of the cursed endeavours of unreasonable power, could you imagine a more genuine nature? Is it not beyond doubt a terrible crime villainously to mar such an admirable spirit, to try to stifle this bright soul in ignorance and stupidity? Love has begun to tear away the veil, and if, thanks to some lucky star, I can deal, as I hope, with this sheer animal, this wretch, this hang-dog, this scoundrel, this brute—

Arnolphe: - Good-bye.

Horace: -Why are you in such a hurry?

Arnolphe: - It just occurs to me that I have a pressing engagement.

Horace: -But do know anyone, for you live close by, who could get access to this house? I am open with you, and it is the usual thing for friends to help each other in these cases. I have no one there now except people who watch me; maid and man, as I just experienced, would not cease their rudeness and listen to me, and do what I

would. I had for some time in my interest an old woman of remarkable shrewdness; in fact more than human. She served me well in the beginning; but the poor woman died four days ago. Can you not devise some plan for me?

Arnolphe: - No, really. You will easily find some one without me.

Horace: -Good-bye then. You see what confidence I put in you.

#### **Scene V: - Arnolphe, *alone*.**

How I am obliged to suffer before him! How hard it is to conceal my gnawing pain! What! Such ready wit in a simpleton? The traitress has pretended to be so to my face, or the devil has breathed this cunning into her heart. But now that cursed letter is the death of me. I see that the rascal has corrupted her mind, and has established himself there in my stead. This is despair and deadly anguish for me. I suffer doubly by being robbed of her heart, for love as well as honour is injured by it. It drives me mad to find my place usurped, and am enraged, to see my prudence defeated. I know that to punish her guilty passion I have only to leave her to her evil fate, and that I shall be revenged on her by herself; but it is very vexatious to lose what we love. Good Heaven! After employing so much philosophy in my choice, why am I to be so terribly bewitched by her charms? She has neither relatives, friends, nor money; she abuses my care, my kindness, my tenderness; and yet I love her to distraction, even after this base trick! Fool, have you no shame? Ah, I cannot contain myself; I am mad; I could punch my head a thousand times over. I shall go in for a little; but only to see what she looks like after so vile a deed. Oh, Heaven, grant that my brow may escape dishonour; or rather, if it is decreed that I must endure it, at least grant me, under such misfortunes, that fortitude with which few are endowed.

### **ACT IV**

#### **Scene I.-Arnolphe, *alone*.**

I declare I cannot rest anywhere; my mind is troubled by a thousand cares, thinking how to contrive, both indoors and out, so as to frustrate the attempts of this coxcomb. With what assurance the traitress stood the sight of me! She is not a whit moved by all that she has done, and though she has brought me within an inch of grave, one could swear, to look at her, that she had no hand in it. The more composed she looked when I saw her, the more I was enraged, and those ardent transports which inflamed my heart seemed to redouble my great love for her. I was provoked, angry, incensed against her, and yet I never saw her look so lovely. Her eyes never seemed to me so bright; never before did they inspire me with such vehement desires; I feel that it will be the death of me, if my evil destiny should bring upon me this disgrace. What! I have brought her up with so much tenderness and forethought; I have had her with me from her infancy; I have indulged in the fondest hopes about her; my heart trusted to her growing charms; I have fondled her as my own for thirteen years, as I imagined—all for a young fool, with whom she is in love, to and carry her off before my face, and that when she is already half married to me! No, by Heaven—no, by Heaven, my foolish young friend; you will be a cunning fellow to overturn my scheme, for upon my word, all your hopes will be in vain, and you shall find no reason for laughing at me!

---

## Scene II- A Notary, Arnolphe.

Notary: - Ah, there he is. Good – day. Here I am, ready to draw up the contract which you wish.

Arnolphe: - (*not seeing or bearing him*).How is to be done?

Notary: -It must be in the usual form.

Arnolphe: - (*thinking to himself alone*).I shall take the greatest possible care.

Notary: - I shall do nothing contrary to your interests.

Arnolphe: - (*not seeing him*) I must guard against all surprise.

Notary: -It is enough that your affairs are placed in my hands. For fear of deception, you must not sign the contract before receiving the portion.

Arnolphe: - (*thinking himself alone*). I fear, if I let anything get abroad, that this business will become town talk.

Notary: -Well, it is easy to avoid this publicity, and your contract can be drawn up privately.

Arnolphe: - (*thinking to himself alone*). But how shall I manage it with her?

Notary: -The jointure should be propotionate to the fortune she brings you.

Arnolphe: - (*not seeing him*) .I love her, and that love is my great difficulty.

Notary: -In that case the wife may have so much more.

Arnolphe: - (*thinking himself alone*). How can I act towards her in such a case?

Notary: - The regular way is that the husband that is to be settles on the wife that is to be a third of her marriage portion as a jointure; but this rule goes for nothing, and you do a great deal more if you have a mind to it.

Arnolphe: - If—(*seeing him*).

Notary: -As for the préciput that is a question for both sides. I say the husband can settle on his wife what he thinks proper.

Arnolphe: - Eh?

Notary: -He can benefit her, when he loves her much, and wishes to do her a favour, and that by way of jointure, or settlement as it is called, which is lost upon her death; either without reversion, going from her to her heirs, or by statute, as people have a mind, or by actual deed of gift in form, which may be made either single or mutual. Why do you shrug your shoulders? Am I talking like a fool or do I not understand contracts? Who can teach me? No one, I imagine. Do I not know that when people are married, they have a joint right to all moveables, moneys, fixtures, and acquisitions, unless they resign it by act of renunciation? Do I not know that a third part of the portion of the wife that is to be becomes common, in order—

---

Arnolphe: - Yes, truly, you know all this; but who has said one word to you about it?

Notary: -You, who seem to take me for a fool, shrugging your shoulders, and making faces at me.

Arnolphe: -Hang the man his beastly face! Good day: that's the way to get rid of you.

Notary: -Was I not brought here to draw up a contract?

Arnolphe: -Yes, I sent for you. But the business is put off; I shall send for you again when the time is fixed. What a devil of a fellow he is with his jabbering.!

Notary (*alone*) I think he is mad, and I believe I am right.

**Scene III:** - A Notary, Alain, Georgette.

Notary: - Did you not come to fetch me your master?

Alain: -Yes.

Notary: - I do not know what you think; but go and tell him from me that he is a downright fool.

Georgette .We will not fail.

**Scene IV.** –Arnolphe,Alain,Georgette.

Alain: - Sir-

Arnolphe: - Come here! You are my faithful, my good, my real friends; I have news for you.

Alain: - The notary-

Arnolphe: - Never mind; some other day for that. A foul plot is contrived against my honour. What a disgrace it would be for you, my children, if your master's honour were taken away! After that, you would not dare to be seen anywhere; for whoever saw you would point at you. So since the affair concerns you as well as me, you must take care that this spark may not in any way—

Georgette: -You have taught us our lesson just now.

Arnolphe: -But take care not to listen to his fine speeches.

Alain: -Oh, certainly-

Georgette: - We know how to deny him.

Arnolphe: -Suppose he should come now, wheedling: “Alain, my good fellow, cheer my drooping spirits by a little help.”

Alain: -You are a fool.

---



Arnolphe: - You are right! (*To Georgette.*) “Georgette, my darling, you look so sweet-tempered and so kind!”

Georgette: -You are a lout.

Arnolphe: -You are right.(*To Alain.*) “What harm do you find in an honest and perfectly virtuous scheme?”

Alain: -You are a rogue.

Arnolphe: -Capital! (*To Georgette.*) “I shall surely die if you do not take pity on my sufferings.”

Georgette: - You are a brazen-faced blockhead.

Arnolphe: -First-rate! (*To Alain.*) “I am not one who expects something for nothing; I can remember those who who serve me. Here, Alain, is a trifle in advance, to have a drink with; and, Georgette, here is where with to buy you a petticoat.(*Both hold out their hands and take the money.*) This is only an earnest of what intend to do for you; I ask no other favour but that you will let me see your pretty mistress.”

Georgette: - (*pushing him*).Try your games elsewhere.

Arnolphe.That was good.

Alain: - (*pushing him*).Get out of this.

Arnolphe: - Very good!

Georgette: - (*pushing him*). Immediately!

Arnolphe: -Good! Hulloo, that is enough.

Georgette: - Am I am not doing right?

Alain: - Is this how you would have us act?

Arnolphe: - Yes, capital; except for the money, which you must not take.

Georgette: -We did not think of that.

Alain: - Shall we begin again now?

Arnolphe: - No. It is enough. Go in both of you.

Alain: -You need only say so.

Arnolphe: -No. I tell you; go in when I desire you. You may keep the money. Go. I shall soon be with you again; keep your eyes open, and second my efforts.

**Scene V: - Arnolphe, alone.**

I will get the cobbler, who lives at the corner of the street, to be my spy, and tell me everything. I mean to keep her always indoors, watch her constantly-and banish in

particular all sellers of ribbon, tire-women, hair-dressers, kerchief-makers, glove-sellers, dealers in cast-off parcel, and all those folks who make it their business clandestinely to bring people together who are in love. Infact, I have seen the world, and understand its tricks. My spark must be very cunning if a love-letter or message gets in here.

**Scene VI.-Horace,Arnolphe.**

Horace: -How lucky I am to meet you here! I had a narrow escape just now, I can assure you. As I left you, I unexpectedly saw Agnès alone on her balcony, breathing the fresh air from the neighbouring trees. After giving me a sign, she contrived to come down into the garden and open the door. But we were scarcely into her room before she heard her jealous gentleman upon the stairs; and all she could do in such a case was to lock me into a large warddrobe. He entered the room at once. I did not see him, but I heard him walking up and down at a greart rate, without saying a word, but sighing desperately at intervals, and occasionally thuping the table, striking a little frisky dog, and madly throwing about whatever came in his way. In his rage he broke the very vases with which the beauty had adorned her mantel-piece; dobtless the tricks she played must have come to the ears of this cuckold in embryo. A last, having in a score of ways vented his passion on things that could not help themselves, my restless jealous gentleman left the room without saying what disturbed him, and I left my wardrobe. We could not stay long together, for fear of rival; it would have been too great a risk. But late to-night I am to enter her room without making a noise. I am to announce myself by three hems, and then the window is to be opened; whereby, with a ladder, and the help of Agnès, my love will try to gain me admittance. I tell you this is my only friend. Joy is increased by imparting it; and should we taste perfect bliss a hundred times over, it would not stisfy us unless it were known to some one. I believe you will sympathize in my success. Good-bye. I am going to make the needful preparations.

**Scene VII.-Arnolphe,alone.**

What, will the star which is bent on driving me to despair allow me no time to breathe? Am I to see, through their mutual understanding, my watchful care and my wisdom defeated one after another? Must I, in my mature age, become the dupe of a simple girl and a scatter-brained young fellow? For twenty years, like a discreet philospher, I have been musing on the wretched fat of married men, and have carefully informed myself of the accidents which plunge the most prudent into misfortune. Profitting in my own mind by the disgrace of others, and having wish to marry, I sought how to secure my forehead from attack, and prevent its being matched with those of other men. For this noble end, I thought I had put in practice all that human policy could invent; but, as though it were decreed by fate that no man here below should be exempt from it, after all my experience an the knowledge I have been able to glean of such matters, after more than twenty years of meditation, so as to guide myself with all precaution, I have avoided the tracks of so many husbands to find myself after all involved in the same disgrace! Ah, cursed fate, you shall yet be a liar! I am still possessor of the loved one! If her heart be stolen by this obnoxious fop, I shall at lest take care that he does not seize anything else. This night, which they have chosen for their pretty plan, shall not be spend so agreeably as they anticipate. It is some pleasure to me, amidst all this, to know that he has warned me of he snare he is laying, and that this blunderer, who would be my ruin, makes a confident of his own rival.

**Scene VIII : -Chrysalde, Arnolphe.**

Chrysalde: - Well, shall we take our supper before our walk?

Arnolphe: -No, I fast to-night.

---

Chrysalde: - Whence this fancy?

Arnolphe: -Pray excuse me; there is something that hinders me.

Chrysalde: -Is not your intended marriage to take place?

Arnolphe: -You take too much trouble about other people's affairs.

Chrysalde: - Oh ho, so snappish? What ails you? Have you encountered any little mishap in your love, my friend? By your face I could almost swear you have.

Arnolphe: -Whatever happens, I shall at least have the advantage of being unlike some folks, who meekly suffer the visits of gallants.

Chrysalde: - It is odd thing that, with so much intelligence, you always get so frightened at these matters; that you set your whole happiness on this, and imagine no other kind of honour in the world. To be a miser, a brute, a rogue, wicked and cowardly, is nothing in your mind compared with this stain; and however a man have lived, he is a man of honour if he is not cuckold. After all, why do you imagine that our glory depends on such accidents, and that a virtuous mind must reproach itself for the evil which it cannot prevent? Tell me, why do you hold that a man in taking a wife deserves praise or blame for the choice he makes, and why do you form a frightful bugbear out of the offence caused by her want of fidelity? Be persuaded that a man of honour may have a less serious notion of cuckoldom; that as none is secure from strokes of chance, this accident ought to be a matter of indifference, and that all the evil, whatever the world may say, is in the mode of receiving it. To behave well under all these difficulties, as in all else, a man must shun extremes; not ape those over-simple folks who are proud of such affairs, and are ever inviting the gallants of their wives, praising them everywhere, and crying them up, displaying their sympathy with them, coming to all their entertainments and all their meetings, and making everyone wonder at their having assurance to show their faces there. This way of acting is no doubt highly culpable; but the other extreme is no less to be condemned. If I do not approve of such as are the friends of their wives' gallants; no more do I approve of your violent men whose indiscreet resentment, full of rage and fury, draws the eyes of all the world on them by its noise, and who seem, from their outbreaks, unwillingly that any one should be ignorant of what is wrong with them. There is a mean between these extremes, where a wise man stops in such a case. When we know how to take it, there is no reason to blush for the worst a woman can do to us. In short, say what you will, cuckolding may easily be made to seem less terrible; and, as I told you before, all your dexterity lies in being able to turn the best side outwards.

Arnolphe: - After this fine harangue, all the brotherhood owes your worship thanks; any one who hears you speak will be delighted to enrol himself.

Chrysalde: -I do not say that; for that is what I have found fault with. But as fortune gives us a wife, I say that we should act as we do when we gamble with dice, when, if you do not get what you want, you must be shrewd and good-tempered, to amend your luck by good management.

Arnolphe: -That is, sleep and eat well, and persuade yourself that it is all nothing.

Chrysalde: -You think to make a joke of it; but, to be candid, I know a hundred things in the world more to be dreaded, and which I should think a much greater misfortune, than the accident you are so grievously afraid of. Do you think that, in choosing between the two alternatives, I should not prefer to be what you say, rather than see myself married to one of those good creatures whose ill-humour makes a

quarrel out of nothing –those dragons of virtue, those respectable she-devils, ever piquing themselves on their wise conduct, who, because they do not do us a trifling wrong, take on themselves to behave haughtily, and because they are faithful to us, expect that we should bear everything for them? Once more, my friend, know that cuckoldom is just what we make of it, that on some accounts it is even to desired, and that it has its pleasures like other things.

Arnolphe: - If you are of a mind to be satisfied with it, I am not disposed to try it myself; and rather than submit to such a thing—

Chrysalde: -Bless me! Do not swear, lest you should be forsworn. If fate has willed it, your precautions are useless; and your advice will not be taken in the matter.

Arnolphe: -I!—I a cuckold!

Chrysalde: -You are in a bad way. A thousand folks are so— I mean no offence—who, for bearing, courage, fortune and family, would scorn comparison with you.

Arnolphe: -And I, on my side, will not draw comparisons with them. But let me tell you, this pleasantry annoys me. Let us have done with it, if you please.

Chrysalde: -You are in a passion. We shall know the cause. Good-bye; but remember, whatever your honour prompts you to do in this business, to swear you will never be what we have talked of is half-way towards being it.

Arnolphe: - And I swear it again! I am going this instant to find a good remedy against such accident.

### **Scene IX: -Arnolphe, Alain, Georgette.**

Arnolphe: -My friends, now is the time that I beg your assistance. I am touched by your affection; but it must be well proved on this occasion; and if you serve me in this, as I am sure, you will, you may count on your reward. The man you wot of( but not a word!) seeks, as I understand, to trick me this very night, and enter, by a ladder, into Agnès' room. But we three must be a trap for him. I would have each of you take a cudgel, and, when he shall be nearly on the top round of the ladder (for I shall open the window at the proper time), both of you shall fall on the rascal for me, so that his back may be sure to remember it, in order that he may learn never to come here again. Yet do it without naming me in any way, or making it appear that I am behind. Would you have the courage to execute my resentment?

Alain: -If the thrashing is all, Sir, rely on us. You shall see, when I beat, if I am a slow coach.

Georgette: -Though my arm may not look so strong, it shall play its part in the drubbing.

Arnolphe: -Get you in, then; and, above all, mind you do not chatter.(*Alone*) This is a useful lesson for my neighbours; if all the husbands in town were to receive their wives', gallants in this fashion, the number of cuckolds would not be so great.

## **ACT V**

### **Scene I: -Arnolphe, Alain, Georgette.**

---

Arnolphe: -Wretchless! What have you done by your violence?

Alain.We have obeyed you, sir.

Arnolphe: - It is no use trying to defend yourselves by such an excuse. My orders were to beat him, not to murder him. I told you to discharge your blows on his back, and not on his head. Good Heavens! Into what a plight my fate has now thrown me! And what course can I take, as the man is dead? Go into the house, and be sure to say nothing of the harmless order that I gave you.(*Alone*) It will be daylight presently, and I shall go and consider how to bear myself under this misfortune. Alas! what will become of me? And what will Horace's father say when he shall suddenly hear of this affair?

## Scene II: -Arnolphe, Horace

Horace: - (*aside*).I must go and make out who it is.

Arnolphe: -(*thinking himself alone*). Could one ever have foreseen-(*Running against Horace.*)Who is there, pray?

Horace: - Is it you Arnolphe?

Arnolphe: -Yes; but who are you?

Horace: - Horace.I was going to your house to beg a favour, you are out very early.

Arnolphe: - (*to himself aside*).Wonderful! Is it a magic? Is it a vision?

Horace: -To tell the truth, I was in a great difficulty; I thank Heaven's great goodness that at the nick of time I thus meet you. Let me tell you that everything has succeeded, much better even than I could have predicted, and by an accident which might have spoiled all. I do not know how our appointment could possibly have been suspected; but just as I was reaching the window, I unluckily saw some persons, who,unceremoniously raising their hand against me, made me miss my footing, and fall to the ground,which,at the expense of a bruise,saved me from a score of blows. These people, of whom I fancy, my jealous rival was one, attributed my fall to their blows, and as the pain compelled me to lie for some time motionless, they honestly thought they had killed me, and were greatly alarmed. I heard all their noise in profound silence. Each accusing the other of the violence, and complaining of their ill fortune, came softly, without a light, to feel if I were dead. You may imagine that I contrived in the darkness of night, to assume the appearance of a real corpse. They went away in great terror, and as I was thinking how I should make my escape, the young Agnès, frightened by my pretended death, came to me in great concern. For the talking of those people had reached her ears from the very first, and, being unobserved during all this commotion, she easily escaped from the house. But finding me unhurt, she displayed a transport, which would be difficult to describe.What more need I say? The lovely girl obeyed the promptings of her affection, would not return to her room, and committed her fate to my honour.You may judge, from this instance of innocence, to what she is exposed by the mad intoleranceof a fool, and what frightful risks she might have run, if I were a man to hold her less dear than I do. But too pure a passion fills my soul; I would rather die than wrong her. I see in her charms worthy of a better fate, and nought but death shall part us. I foresee the rage my father will be in. But we must find an opportunity to appease his anger. I cannot help being transported by charms so delightful; and in short, we must in this life be satisfied with our lot. What I wish you to do, as a confidential friend, is to let me place this beauty under your care; and that,in the interest of my love, you will conceal her flight from every one, to prevent any

successful pursuit of her, you know that a young girl, especially such a beautiful one, would be strongly suspected in the company of a young man; and as I have trusted the whole secret of my passion to you, being assured of your prudence, so to you only, as a generous friend, can confide this beloved treasure.

Arnolphe: -Be assured I am entirely at your service.

Horace: -You will really do me so great a favour?

Arnolphe: -Very willingly, I tell you; I am delighted at the opportunity of serving you. I thank Heaven for putting it in my way; I never did anything with so much pleasure.

Horace: -How much I am obliged to for all your kindness! I feared a difficulty on your part; but you know the world, and your wisdom can excuse the ardour of youth. One of my servants is with her at the corner of this street.

Arnolphe: -But how shall we manage, for day begins to break? If I take her here, I may be seen; and if you come to my house the servants will talk. To take a safe course you must bring her to me in a darker place. That alley of mine is convenient; I shall wait for her there.

Horace: - It is quite right to use these precautions. I shall only place her in your hands, and return at once to my lodgings, without more ado.

Arnolphe: - (*alone*). Ah, fortune! This propitious accident makes amends for all the mischief which your caprice has done! (*He muffles himself up in his cloak.*)

### Scene III: -Agnès, Horace, Arnolphe.

Horace: - (to Agnès). Do not be uneasy at the place I am taking you. I conduct you to a safe abode. It would ruin all for you to lodge with me. Go in at this door, and follow where you are led. (*ARNOLPHE takes her hand, without being recognised by her.*)

Agnès: - (to Horace). Why do you leave me?

Horace: - Dear Agnès, it must be so.

Agnès: -Remember, then, I pray you to return soon.

Horace: -My love urges me sufficiently for that.

Agnès: -I feel no joy but when I see you.

Horace: -Away from you I also am sad.

Agnès: -Alas, if that were so, you would stay here.

Horace: -What! Can you doubt my excessive love?

Agnès: - No; you do not love me as much as I love you! Ah, he is pulling me too hard! (*Arnolphe pulls her away*).

---

Horace: -It is because it is dangerous, dear Agnès, for us to be seen together here; this true friend, whose hand draws you away, acts with the prudent zeal that inspires him on our behalf.

Agnès: -But to follow a stranger—

Horace: -Fear nothing. In such hands you cannot but be safe.

Agnès: -I would rather be in Horace's and I should—(To Arnolphe, *who still drags her away*). Stay a little.

Horace: -Farewell. The day drives me away.

Agnès: -When shall I see you, then?

Horace: -Very soon, you may be sure.

Agnès: -How weary I shall be till I do!

HORACE (*going*). Thank Heaven, my happiness is no longer in suspense; I can sleep securely.

#### Scene IV Arnolphe, Agnès

Arnolphe (*concealed by his clock, and disguising his voice*). Come; it is not there you are going to lodge. I have provided a room for you elsewhere, and intend to place you where you will be safe enough. (*Discovering himself*.) Do you know me?

Agnès: -Ah!

Arnolphe: -My face frightens you now, hussy; it is a disappointment to you to see me here. I interrupt your love and its pretty contrivances. (*Agnès looks for Horace*). Do not imagine you can call your lover to your aid with those eyes of yours; he is too far off to give you any assistance. Soo, so! young as you are, You can play such pranks. Your simplicity, that seemed so extraordinary, asks if infants come through ear; yet you manage to make an assignation by night, and to slink out silently in order to follow your gallant? Gad, how coaxing your tongue was with him! You must have been at a good school. Who the deuce has taught you so much all on a sudden? You are no longer afraid, then, to meet ghosts; this gallant has given you courage in the night time. Ah, baggage, to arrive at such a pitch of deceit! To form such a plot in spite of all my kindness! Little serpent that I have warmed in my bosom, and that as soon as it feels it is alive, tries ungratefully to injure him that cherished it!

Agnès: -Why do you scold me?

Arnolphe: -Of a truth, I do wrong!

Agnès: -I am not conscious of harm in all that I have done.

Arnolphe: -To run after a gallant is not, then, an infamous thing?

Agnès: -He is one who says he wishes to marry me. I followed your directions; you have taught me that we ought to marry in order to avoid sin.

---

Arnolphe: -Yes; but I meant to take you to wife myself; I think I gave you to understand it clearly enough.

Agnès: -You did. But, to be frank with you, he is more to my taste for a husband than you. With you, marriage is a trouble and a pain, and your descriptions give a terrible picture of it; but there—he makes it seem so full of joy that I long to marry.

Arnolphe: -Oh, traitress, that is because you love him!

Agnès: -Yes, I love him.

Arnolphe: -And you have the impudence to tell me so!

Agnès: -Why, if it is true, should I not say so?

Arnolphe: - Ought you to love him minx?

Agnès: -Alas! Can I help it? He alone is the cause of it; I was not thinking of it when it came about.

Arnolphe: -But you ought to have driven away that amorous desire.

Agnès: -How can we drive away what gives us pleasure?

Arnolphe: -And did you not know that it would displease me?

Agnès: -I? Not at all. What harm can it do you?

Arnolphe: -True. I ought to rejoice at it. You do not love me then after all?

Agnès: -You?

Arnolphe: - Yes.

Agnès: -Alas! No.

Arnolphe. How! No?

Agnès: -Would you have me tell a fib?

Arnolphe: -Why not love me, Madam Impudence?

Agnès: -Heaven! You ought not to blame me. Why did you not make yourself loved, as he has done? I did not prevent you, I fancy.

Arnolphe: -I tried all I could; but all my pains were to no purpose.

Agnès: -Of a truth then he knows more about it than you; for he had no difficulty in making himself loved.

Arnolphe: -(*aside*). See how the jade reasons and retorts! Plague! could one of your witty ladies say more about it? Ah, I was a dolt; or else, on my honour, a fool of a girl knows more than the wisest, man. (*To Agnès.*) Since you are so good at reasoning, Madam Chop-logic, should I have maintained you so long for his benefit?

---



Agnès: - No. He will pay you back, even to the last farthing.

Arnolphe: - (*aside*).She hits on words that double my vexation. (*Aloud*). With all his ability, hussy, will he discharge me the obligations that you owe me?

Agnès: -I do not owe you so much as you may think.

Arnolphe: -Was the care of bringing you up nothing?

Agnès: -Verily, you have been at great pains there, and have caused me to be finely taught throughout. Do you think I flatter myself so far as not to know in my own mind that I am an ignoramus? I am ashamed of myself, and at my age, I do not wish to pass any longer for a fool, if I can help it.

Arnolphe: -You shrink from ignorance, and would learn something of your spark, at any cost.

Agnès: -To be sure. It is from him I know what I do know; I fancy I owe him much more than you.

Arnolphe: -Really, what prevents me from revenging this saucy talk with a cuff? I am enraged at the sight of her provoking coldness: and to beat her would be a satisfaction to me.

Agnès: -Ah, you can do that if you choose.

Arnolphe (*aside*).That speech and that look disarm my fury, and bring back the tenderness to my heart which effaces all her guilt. How strange it is to be in love! To think that men should be subject to such weakness for these traitresses! Everyone knows their imperfection. They are extravagant and indiscreet. Their mind is wicked and their understanding weak. There is nought weaker, more imbecile, more faithless; and, in spite of all , everything in the world is done for the sake of these bipeds.(*To Agnès*). Well, let us make peace. Listen, little wretch, I forgive all, and restore you to my affection. Learn thus how much I love you; and, seeing me so good, love me in return.

Agnès: -With all my heart I should like to please you, if it were in my power.

Arnolphe: -Poor little darling, you can if you will. Just listen to this sigh of love. See this dying look, behold my person, and forsake this young coxcomb and the love he inspires. He must have thrown some spell over you, and you will be a hundred times happier with me. Your desire is to be finely dressed and frolicsome; then I swear you shall be ever so; I will fondle you night and day, I will hug you, kiss you, devour you; you shall do everything you have a mind to.I do not enter into particulars; and that is saying everything. (*Aside*).To what length will passions go? (*Aloud*).In short, nothing can equal my love. What proof would you have me give you, ungrateful girl? Would you have me weep? Shall I beat myself? Shall I tear out one half of my hair? Shall I kill myself? Yes, say so if you will. I am quite ready, cruel creature, to convince you of my love.

Agnès: -Stay.All you say does not touch my heart. Horace could do more with a couple of words.

Arnolphe: -Ah, this is too great an insult, and provokes my anger too far.I will pursue my design, you intractable brute, and will pack you out of the town forthwith. You

reject my addresses and drive me to extremities: but the innermost cell of a convent shall avenge me of all.

#### **Scene V-Arnolphe, Agnès, Alain.**

Alain: - I do not know it is, master, but it seems to me that Agnès and the corpse have run away together.

Arnolphe: -She is here. Go and shut her up in my room. (*Aside*). Horace will not come here to see her. Besides, it is only for an hour. (*To Alain*). Go and get a carriage, for I mean to find her a safe dwelling. Shut yourself safely in, and, above all, do not take your eyes off her. (*Alone*). Perhaps when her mind is buried in solitude, she will be disabused of this passion.

#### **Scene VI: – Horace, Arnolphe.**

Horace: -Oh, I come here, plunged in grief. Heaven, Mr. Arnolphe has decreed my ill fortune! By a fatal stroke of extreme justice, I am to be torn away from the beauty whom I love. My father arrived this evening. I found him alighting close by. In a word the reason of his coming, with which, as I said, I was unacquainted, is that he made a match for me, without a word of warning; he has arrived here to celebrate the nuptials. Feel for my anxiety and judge if a more cruel disappointment could happen to me. That Enrique, whom I asked about you yesterday, is the source of all my trouble. He has come with my father to complete my ruin; it is for his only daughter that I am destined. I thought I should have swooned when they first spoke of it; not caring to hear more, as my father spoke of paying you a visit, I hurried here before him, mind full of consternation. I pray you be sure not to let him know anything of my engagement, which might incense him; and try, since he has confidence in you, to dissuade him from this other match.

Arnolphe: -Ah, to be sure!

Horace: -Advise him to delay; and thus, like a friend, help me in my passion.

Arnolphe: -No fear!

Horace: -All my hope is in you.

Arnolphe: -It could be better placed.

Horace: -I look on you as my real father. Tell him that my age- Ah, I see him coming. Hear the arguments I can supply you with.

#### **Scene VII.-Enrique,Oronte,Chrysalde,Horace,Arnolphe.**

Enrique(*to Chrysalde*): -As soon as I saw you, before anyone could tell me, I should have known you. I recognise in your face the features of your lovely sister, whom marriage made in former days. Happy should I have been if cruel fate had permitted me to bring that faithful wife, to enjoy with me the greater delight of seeing once more, after our continual misfortunes, all her former friends. But since the irresistible power of destiny has for ever deprived us of her dear presence, let us try to submit, and to be content with the only fruit of love which remains to me. It concerns you nearly; without your consent I should do wrong in wishing to dispose of this pledge. The choice of the son of Oronte is honourable in itself; but you must be pleased with this choice as well as I.

---

Chrysalde: -It would argue a poor opinion of my judgement to doubt my approbation of so reasonable choice.

Arnolphe (*aside to Horace*).Ay, I will serve you finely!

Horace: -Beware, once more-

Arnolphe: -Have no uneasiness. (*Leaves Horace, and goes upto to embrace Oronte.*)

Oronte: -Ah, this is indeed a tender embrace.

Arnolphe: -How delighted I am to see you!

Oronte: -I've come here—

Arnolphe: -I know what brings you, without telling me.

Oronte: -You have already heard?

Arnolphe: -Yes

Oronte: -So much the better.

Arnolphe: -Your son is opposed to this match; his heart being pre-engaged, he looks on it as a misfortune. He has even prayed me to dissuade you from it; for my part, all the advice I can give you is, to exert a father's authority, and not allow the marriage to be delayed. Young people should be managed with a high hand; we do them harm by being indulgent.

Horace: - (*aside*) Oh, the traitor!

Chrysalde: -If it is repugnant to him, I think we ought not to force him. I think my brother will be of my mind.

Arnolphe: -What? Will he let himself be ruled by his son? Would you have a father so weak as to be unable to make his son obey him? It would be fine indeed to see him at his time of life receiving orders from one who ought to receive them from him. No, no, he is my intimate friend, and his honour is my own. His word is passed, and he must keep it. Let him now display his firmness, and control his son's affections.

Oronte: -You speak well; in this match I will answer for my son's obedience.

Chrysalde (*to Arnolphe*): - I am indeed surprised at the great eagerness which you show for the marriage, and cannot guess what is your motive—

Arnolphe: -I know what I am about, and speak sensibly.

Oronte: -Yes, yes. M. Arnolphe; he is—

Chrysalde: -That name annoys him. He is Monsieur de la Souche, as you were told before.

Oronte: -It makes no difference.

---

Horace: - (*aside*).What do I hear?

Arnolphe: - (*turning to Horace*).Ay, that is the mystery; you can judge as to what it behooved me to do.

Horace (*aside*) What a scrape—

### **Scene VIII.-Enrique, Oronte, Chrysalde, Horace, Georgette.**

Georgette: -Sir, if you do not come, we shall scarcely be able to hold Agnès; she is trying all she can to get away; I fear she will throw herself out of the window.

---

Arnolphe: -Bring her to me, for I mean to take her away. (*To HORACE*).Do not be disturbed. Continual good fortune makes a man proud. Every dog has his day, as the proverb says.

Horace: - (*aside*) Good Heaven, what misfortunes can equal mine? Was ever a man in such a mess as this?

Arnolphe: - (*to Oronte*).Hasten the day of the ceremony. I am bent on it, and invite myself beforehand.

Oronte: -That is just my intention.

### **Scene IX- Agnès,Oronte,Enrique,Arnolphe,Horace,Chrysalde,Alain,Georgette.**

Arnolphe: - (*to Agnès*): -Come hither, my beauty,whom they cannot hold,and who rebels. Here is your gallant, to whom, to make amends, you may make a sweet and humble curtsy. (*To Horace*). Farewell. The issue rather thwarts your desires; but all lovers are not fortunate.

Agnès: -Horace, will you let me be carried off in this manner?

Horace: -I scarcely know where I am, my sorrow is so great.

Arnolphe: - Come along, chatterbox.

Agnès: - I shall stay here.

Oronte: -Tell us the meaning of this mystery. We are all staring at each other without being able to understand.

Arnolphe: -I shall inform you at a more convenient time. Till then, good-bye.

Oronte: -Where are you going? You do not speak to us as you should.

Arnolphe: -I have advised you to complete the marriage, let Horace grumble as much as he likes.

Oronte: -Ay; but to complete it, have you not heard –if they have told you all-that the lady concerned in this affair is in your house?—that she is the daughter of Enrique

and of the lovely Angelica, who were privately married? Now, what was at the bottom of your talk just now?

Chrysalde: -I too was astonished at this proceeding.

Arnolphe: - What?

Chrysalde: -My sister had a daughter by a secret marriage, whose existence was concealed from the whole family.

Oronte: - And in order that nothing might be discovered, she was put out to nurse in the country by her husband, under a feigned name.

Chrysalde: -At that time, fortune being against him, he was compelled to quit his native land.

---

Oronte: -To encounter a thousand various dangers in far-distant countries, and beyond many seas.

Chrysalde: -Where his industry has acquired what in his own land he lost through roguery and envy.

Oronte: -And when he returned to France, the first thing he did was to seek out her to whom he had confided the care of his daughter.

Chrysalde: -This country-woman frankly told him that she had committed her to your keeping from the age of four.

Oronte: -And that she did it because she received money from you, and was very poor.

Chrysalde: -Oronte, transported with joy, has even brought this woman hither.

Oronte: -In short, you shall see her here directly to clear up this mystery to every one.

Chrysalde (*to Arnolphe*).I can almost imagine what is the cause of your grief; but fortune is kind to you. If it seems so good to you not to be a cuckold, your only course is not to marry.

Arnolphe (*going away full of rage, and unable to speak*).Ugh!ugh!ugh!

Oronte: -Why does he run away without saying a word?

Horace: -Ah, father, you shall know the whole of this surprising mystery. Accident has done here what your wisdom intended. I had engaged myself to this beauty in the sweet bonds of mutual love; it is she, in a word, whom you come to seek, and for whose sake I was about to grieve you by my refusal.

Enrique: -I was sure of it as soon as I saw her; my heart has yearned for her ever since. Ah, daughter, I am overcome by such tender transports!

---

Chrysalde: -I could be so, brother, just as well as you. But this is hardly the place for it. Let us go inside, and clear up these mysteries. Let us show our friend some return for his great pains, and thank Heaven, which orders all for the best.

---

End.

■ The concept encompasses the theatrical tradition, which reveals experiences of Scottishness and differs from the idea of Scotland's theatre - the presence of theatre in the geographical boundaries of the country, or National Drama of nineteenth century enormously linked to the staged adaptations of the historical novels of Sir Walter Scott. Both forms are discussed in Bill Findlay's *A History of Scottish Theatre* (1998).

ii The Liverpool Poets - Adrian Henri (1932-2000), Roger McGough (1937- ), and Brian Patten (1946- ) began their careers in poetry by giving readings in the clubs and coffee bars of Liverpool in the 1960s. They wrote their poetry to be read aloud, and their audiences were young Liverpudlians who might normally have attended pop concerts, but were now finding that poetry could be equally accessible and appealing. Their poems deal with ordinary people in everyday situations. Their main influences were the Beat poets of America, particularly Alan Ginsberg, who impressed them when he visited Liverpool, and French Symbolist poetry, such as that of Baudelaire and Rimbaud. They were not interested in imitating the form or subject matter of the writers they admired, but were, rather, inspired by the mood and tone of their poems, and by their power to make an immediate emotional impact on the reader.

iii The phrase has been coined by Joy Hendry and belongs to a chapter of *In Other Words: Writing as a Feminist* (1987, pp. 32-43)

iv *Kailyard* is usually attributed to the critic George Blake, who described its essential elements as domesticity, rusticity, humour, humility, modesty, decency, piety and poverty (Shepherd 1988).

v The Caledonian Antiszygy is a term coined by Gregory Smith in *Scottish Literature: Character and Influence* (1909), which refers to the "idea of duelling polarities within one entity".

vi Jacobites saw themselves continuing the struggles of Wallace and Bruce. Jacobite imagery and rhetoric were potent means of communication and their adoption of the topics and language of folk literature had an enduring effect on the future Scottish literary traditions, in particular the image of the neglected feminised Scotland. Such images can be found in Drummond's *Forth Feastings* (1617), the anti-union speech of Lord Belhaven (1656-1708) which has its counterpart in the feminised nationality of Scotland (Pittock 2001, p.69). Jacobite rhetoric was drawn close to the discourse of classical Rome with its stress on decadence in the work of Juvenal and Tacitus ... applied nostalgia in contrast to the economic growth sought by the Enlightenment proponents (Pittock 2001, p.70).

vii For a weak culture (any culture lacking theatrical tradition or experiencing lack of local playwriting) the translations of classical texts turns into a process of tradition making (Aaltonen 2000).

viii The influence of the writer and important cultural figure Walter Scott, which is traditionally perceived as a speaker of Scottish identity, should be critically evaluated. On the one hand, his writing introduced a historical displacement which brought the sentiment of cultural loss and the theme of nostalgia which will become recurrent in the years to follow. In the view of Wallace Notestein, Scottish sentimentalism appeared as a new cultural trait as a result of an attempt to reconcile the images of the Highlander and Lowlander, expressed in the new literary writing, the recurrent themes and icons of Mary Queen of Scots, the kilt, Burns and the songs of the music hall, especially the ones of Sir Harry Lauder (*The Scot in History* p. 326). However, on the other hand, it contributed to the development of Scottish humour, seen as an old Scottish trait by the same critic. A more recent critical view in a collection of essays on Post-colonial Europe argues that 'Scott's novels in fact both dislocate and postpone, both preface and post-script, authentic Scottishness' (Fetzer 2012, p. 86).

---

Margaret Fetzter studies *Rob Roy* and *Waverley* through the critical prism of racial identities of Paul Gilroy coming to the conclusion that England and Scotland were not represented as radical others (Fetzter, p. 87). Therefore, it is legitimate to suggest that Scott's writings open the door for the establishment of unionist nationalism, which could be interpreted in the dialectic of the Scottish – British identity but it could also serve to view its historical role as uniting/reconciling the Lowlander with the Highlander psychologies which in the future will thrive in the cultural image of multilingualism. Furthermore, it nourished popular folkloric literature development and Scottish humour which will flourish in the popular entertainment forms of the music hall in the next 50-60 years before the Scottish Renaissance of the 1920s and prepare the establishment of a unique theatrical voice after World War II in Scotland

<sup>ix</sup> Scott's narratives include historical epochs which are identified with geographical places (Highlands – past; England – present and future) and then those places are identified psychologically (Highlands – imagination; England – reason). Scott described it as a split between 'the heart' (Scotland) and 'the head' (England). In his understanding, imagination stood for the primitive, barbaric and in this sense inferior to history (equal to reason, progress and civilisation) entity.

<sup>x</sup> Ger. *Das Unheimliche* - literally, "un-home-ly" is a Freudian concept of an instance where something can be familiar, yet foreign at the same time, resulting in a feeling of it being uncomfortably strange.

### Chapter 3

<sup>xi</sup> I decided to transpose the action to Glasgow because of the similarities with the north European working-class port city of Hamburg – the architecture of the language and the buildings. For instance, the German "greinen" for whining corresponds to the Scottish "girnin" and so much so that: 'the true hero of the play is the language. And it is an anti-hero.' (Leonard 2010)

<sup>xii</sup>

<sup>¶</sup> Ger. *Das Unheimliche* - literally, "un-home-ly" is a Freudian concept of an instance where something can be familiar, yet foreign at the same time, resulting in a feeling of it being uncomfortably strange.

<sup>xiii</sup> Cyrano of Morgan –used the original text, entirely into Scots, preparation for Phaedra in 2000 commissioned by the Royal Lyceum theatre - he produced a highly individualistic stage Scots based on 'urban Glaswegian Scots supplemented by other forms of Scots or English if needed' (2004, p.173). Morgan makes a conscious choice to apply urban Glaswegian Scots as a national language based on the following assumption:

It is widely spoken, can accommodate contemporary reference, it is not incapable of the lyrical and the poetic, and comes unburdened by the baggage of the older Scots which was thought suitable for historical plays (Findlay 2004, p. 189).

Behind Morgan's theatre translations stood a mixture of artistic and nationalistic motives. David Kinloch sees Morgan's language as intransitive act (in a sense a gesture), which enables its contemporary audience to identify it as 'a classical piece of multivocal flying' (Findlay 2004, p. 136)

<sup>xiv</sup> Lochhead converted the king into the aloof omnipotent but rather unspecific figure of Mr Prime, but it is directed in ways in which political power in general is mediated and appropriated by the affluent upper echelon of society (Findlay 2004, p. 109).

### Chapter 4

<sup>xv</sup> The other two Greek plays were *Oedipus Rex* and *Electra*. The artistic director of theatre babel, Graham McLaren, commissioned them to David Greig and Tom McGrath. None of these playwrights applied any Scots in their versions.



---

xvi Molière's rhyming hexameter is a form that very rarely appears in English verse, and has a clumsy quality when it does, at least according to Alexander Pope (1965: 47), who, in his 'An Essay on Criticism' (l. 357), saw it as a measure 'that, like a wounded snake, drags its slow length along'. Translations of Molière have therefore usually opted either for prose – Baker and Miller's choice back in 1739 – or for the kind of rhymed iambic pentameter used in Richard Wilbur's translation of *Tartuffe* (Wilbur, 1982). Christopher Hampton (1984) offers another possibility in the blank verse used in his Royal Shakespeare Company version, but none of these solutions is ideal. Prose translations sound, well, *prosaic*, losing some of the rhythm and colour of the original. Richard Wilbur's verse, on the other hand, is *so* regular in rhythm and rhyme that it eventually seems repetitive and trite. Describing its effects in productions, two critics arrived – presumably independently – at the phrase 'jog-trot'.<sup>3</sup> Sensibly enough, Hampton reasons that, since Molière's hexameters – Alexandrines – were the standard measure of the golden age of French drama, they are most naturally rendered in English by the decasyllabic blank verse used by English dramatists in *their* golden age. Yet, perhaps because it does have such strong associations with the grand vision of Elizabethan drama, his version's blank verse sometimes seems too sober and serious for some of the pantomime-like comedic elements discussed above. (Stevenson 2004, p.113)

xvii Finding a rhyme in Scots presents difficulties rather more finite and negotiable. Lochhead's *Tartuffe* often exploits greater phonetic flexibility in a more colloquially-based Scots to sustain rhymes unimaginable in standard English. For example, Orgon's judgement of Tartuffe that 'The felly/Jist turns whit folk haud sacred inty his moral umb'relly' [The fellow/Just turns what folk hold sacred into his moral umbrella] (V.vii) succeeds in creating a rhyme out of unpromising constituents while also preserving much of Molière's original metaphor, which suggests of Tartuffe that '*il sait ... /Se faire un beau manteau de tout ce qu'on révère*' [he is able to make himself a fine overcoat out of all that is revered] (Stevenson 2004, p.113).

xviii A humorous defect, usually imbalance of the four humours of human temperament which makes them laughable in New Comedy.

xix The term originated in French comedy, usually a comic female character in the role of a chambermaid. Most often of an independent nature, the soubrette demonstrated a non-conformist attitude coupled with a down-to-earth approach and native humour. Quick-witted and subtle, the soubrette developed greater popularity and recognition in comic opera and the operetta. During this period in the eighteenth century she became fixed as a type.